

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



105 462

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Now Is The Time To Prevent A Third World War

By
Kirby Page

Published by
 Kirby Page, La Habra, California

Books by KIRBY PAGE

NOW IS THE TIME TO PREVENT A THIRD WORLD WAR, 1946*
THE LIGHT IS STILL SHINING IN THE DARKNESS, 1946*
THE WILL OF GOD FOR THESE DAYS, 1945*
LIVING ABUNDANTLY, 1944*
LIVING PRAYERFULLY, 1941*
RELIGIOUS RESOURCES FOR PERSONAL LIVING AND SOCIAL
ACTION, 1939
MUST WE GO TO WAR? 1937
LIVING COURAGEOUSLY, 1936
LIVING TRIUMPHANTLY, 1934
INDIVIDUALISM AND SOCIALISM, 1933
LIVING CREATIVELY, 1932*
THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS, 1932
NATIONAL DEFENSE, 1931
JESUS OR CHRISTIANITY, 1929
DOLLARS AND WORLD PEACE, 1927
IMPERIALISM AND NATIONALISM, 1925
AN AMERICAN PEACE POLICY, 1925
WAR: ITS CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES, AND CURE, 1923
CHRISTIANITY AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS, 1922
THE SWORD OR THE CROSS, 1921
SOMETHING MORE, 1920

Co-Author with SHERWOOD EDDY

CREATIVE PIONEERS, 1937
MAKERS OF FREEDOM, 1926
THE ABOLITION OF WAR, 1924

Books Edited by KIRBY PAGE

A NEW ECONOMIC ORDER, 1930
RECENT GAINS IN AMERICAN CIVILIZATION, 1928

Pamphlets by KIRBY PAGE

HOW GOD DEALS WITH EVILDOERS, 1942*
HOW TO KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR, 1939
also SIXTEEN OTHER PAMPHLETS

*These are still available

I. WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE.....	1
II. IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE.....	12
1. Friendly Relations With Soviet Russia.....	12
2. International Government.....	39
3. Economic Justice and Fellowship.....	60
4. Racial Justice and Fellowship.....	73
5. Empires Into Commonwealths.....	80
6. Disarmament.....	87
7. Winning Germany and Japan.....	89
8. A Mighty Movement of Peoples.....	93
9. Next Steps for Everyman.....	97
10. The Time Factor.....	101
III. THE CHURCHES AND WAR.....	103
1. The Way of Jesus and the Way of War.....	103
2. The Record of the Churches.....	138
IV. THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR.....	163
1. The Crisis of 1914.....	164
2. Nationalism.....	169
3. Imperialism.....	175
4. Militarism.....	180
5. Allies and Balance of Power.....	185
6. Ultimatums and Military Time-Table.....	187
V. THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR II.....	189
1. The Policy of France.....	189
2. Prophecies of Disaster.....	193
3. Economic Factors.....	196
4. Psychological Factors.....	202
5. Political Factors.....	206
6. Failure of World Disarmament Conference.....	215
7. What Would Englishmen, Frenchmen, Americans Have Done?.....	219
8. The Role of Adolf Hitler.....	224
9. The German Republic Could Have Been Preserved.....	230
VI. THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC.....	243
1. The Record of European Powers in the Far East.....	243
2. The Aggression of Japan.....	252
3. The Record of the United States in the Far East.....	271
4. The Pre-Pearl-Harbor Policy of the United States.....	286
VII. THE POWER OF GOD IN AN ATOMIC AGE.....	330

CHAPTER I

WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE

The siren routed us out of bed in the middle of the night of August 24th in the year 1916. I was working as a secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association with British troops and we were stationed in an army camp near Canterbury. We rushed out of our tents and saw high above us the cigar-shaped German Zeppelin. A few hours later we learned that bombs had been dropped on the neighboring cities of Folkestone and Dover and that nine individuals had been killed and forty wounded. Subsequently I witnessed three Zeppelin raids over London.

The peoples of the Allied world and of neutral countries were shocked and outraged by this evidence of German inhumanity and bestiality. Statesmen and publicists and clergymen all over the earth agreed that only Huns could be guilty of such monstrous and fiendish behavior as the dropping of bombs on men, women and children sleeping peacefully in their beds in great cities.

The first Zeppelin raid over England came in January, 1915. In the first raid over London on May 1, 1915, between ninety and one hundred bombs were dropped, five individuals were killed and fourteen injured. In the second Zeppelin attack on London on September 7th, thirty-five bombs were dropped, sixteen persons were killed, thirty injured, and the damage to property was about \$50,000. *All the Zeppelin raids of the entire war caused the death of 435 persons, and injured 1,069 others. About 5,000 bombs were dropped, with 700 tons of explosives.*¹

With 435 individuals dead, and another 1,069

wounded, an Englishman wrote: "Clausewitz did not live nor write in vain. His gospel of ruthless savagery and invocation to 'shut the gates of mercy on mankind' when engaged in war, has from the beginning stimulated every German act . . . There is no room for sportsmanship, no use for chivalry, in the German code of war." And ten thousand other writers expressed in more extreme language their horror of German atrocity in dropping bombs upon huge cities.

This reaction of the peoples of the earth was sound. A German air raid on London was an atrocity. An atrocity it was and an atrocity it will always be to drop high explosive and fire upon populations in great cities. Thus the ruthless bombing of Chinese cities by Japanese air forces deserved the vigorous condemnation of sensitive men all around the earth. And the barbarous devastation of Polish cities by Nazi air attacks could not be described adequately even with the language of bitter denunciation. An air raid on a big city was an atrocity and atrocity it will always be.

By the year 1945, nevertheless, most people of the United Nations were rejoicing over the winning of the war through destruction from the air of numerous German and Japanese cities, and were revealing scarcely a qualm of conscience over this unequaled devastation and annihilation. The practice from which they had recoiled in horror less than three decades previously, they were now using with cold premeditation and concentrated skill. And nothing like the havoc they wrought had ever been seen before on this earth. A post-war committee appointed by the President and headed by Franklin D'Olier, president of Pru-

WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE

dential Life Insurance Company, surveyed the damage done in Germany and reported that Allied air power:

Killed 300,000,
Wounded 780,000,
Destroyed or badly damaged 3,600,000 German dwelling units,
Made 7,500,000 people homeless.²

In a summary of damage done in Japan, General Carl A. Spaatz, of the United States Army Strategic Air Forces, said that B-29's destroyed the major portion of 59 Japanese cities, traveling a total of 100,000,000 miles in making these assaults.³ The Tokyo radio on August 23, 1945, gave the following results of air raids:⁴

Killed 260,000,
Wounded 412,000,
Houses completely demolished or burned down 2,210,000,
Made homeless 9,200,000.

This table of total figures deserves serious reflection:

Killed in Allied air raids—560,000 individuals,
Wounded in Allied air raids—1,192,000 individuals,
Homes demolished or burned—5,810,000,
Individuals made homeless—16,700,000.

All the German Zeppelin raids over England from 1915 to 1918:

Killed—435 individuals,
Wounded—1,069 others.

Yet there was far more indignation in Allied countries over the atrocity of killing and wounding these 1,504 individuals, than there was a sense of horror in the same Allied lands thirty years later over the killing and wounding of these 1,752,000 Germans and Japanese through obliteration bombing, although the latter number was a thousand times greater than the former figure. *In the meantime the peoples of the earth had suffered so terribly from Nazi and Fascist and*

Japanese atrocities that they were determined to use any and every means in destroying these totalitarian governments. Allied military leaders told their peoples and governments that obliteration bombing of civilians was necessary to the winning of the war. And so total atrocity, all-out obliteration bombing of cities, became the respectable means of self-defense. The doctrine of military necessity was taken over without moral qualification: mass promiscuous killing of men, women and children is right because it is necessary in self-defense. And because mass promiscuous killing is right, Allied generals who gave orders to demolish and burn German and Japanese cities, and Allied airmen who carried out these commands, did not often recognize that they were perpetrating atrocity and did not usually recoil in horror from the awfulness of the thing they were doing. To this point had the human mind been driven: atrocity ceases to be atrocity when it becomes necessity. With scarcely a twinge of conscience many Allied airmen killed German and Japanese wives and babies in an effort to protect their own families. And they engaged in mass promiscuous killing in the name of high ideals. Human life ceased to have value when military necessity required wholesale slaughter.

Then came August 6, 1945.

With the dropping of the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, a new epoch in human history began. Mankind now has in its hands sufficient explosive energy to destroy the cities of civilization and to blot out the lives of a high proportion of the human race. A single bomb, the first primitive product of a new science, completely destroyed 60 per

cent of the houses in this city of 318,000 population, and severely damaged most of the houses in the remainder of the city. The total number of persons killed will never be known accurately, but the estimates are from 53,000 to 80,000 dead, with a high proportion of all residents injured more or less seriously.

After a visit to the ruins, Dr. Philip Morrison, one of the scientists who worked on the Los Alamos bomb, reported that "of 300 registered physicians, more than 260 were unable to aid the injured. Of 2,400 nurses, orderlies and trained first-aid workers, more than 1,800 were made casualties in a single instant. It was the same everywhere . . . Not one hospital in the city was left in condition to shelter patients . . . Debris filled the street and thousands of fires burned unchecked among the injured and the dead."⁵

Nearly a month later, W. H. Lawrence cabled the *New York Times* on September 3rd: "The atomic bomb still is killing Japanese at a rate of 100 daily in flattened, rubble-strewn Hiroshima . . . I was among the first few foreigners to reach the site of this historic bombing and walked for nearly two hours today through streets where the stench of death still pervades and survivors or relatives of the dead, wearing gauze patches over their mouths, still probe among the ruins for bodies or possessions. This is the world's most damaged city, worse than Warsaw or Stalingrad, which held the record in Europe . . . So terrible was the blast that every wounded person thought he had been hit by an individual bomb . . . As a war correspondent in Europe and the Pacific, I have never looked upon such scenes of death and

WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE

destruction. It was enough to take your breath away when standing in the center of the area where the bomb fell."

So thoroughly had the American people been indoctrinated with the idea of military necessity that for most of them the statement that the atomic bomb brought the war to an end more quickly and saved thousands of American lives was all the justification needed for its use. Atrocity had ceased to be atrocity when it saved American lives. Moral sensitivity had become so seared and deadened that the atrocity of massacring 50,000 human beings created in the image of God was hailed as a supreme blessing to mankind.⁶

It is this moral callousness which makes the release of atomic energy so ominous for the human race. Peoples have become so accustomed to the idea that in self-defense any practice is justifiable that there is reason to be apprehensive about the use that will be made of atomic bombs. Generals and admirals take it for granted that the American people must continue to prepare to use all the weapons of obliteration and annihilation without regard to moral considerations. Many months after the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, the War Department announced that the manufacture of atomic bombs was steadily continuing and that an ample reserve supply was being stored for use in any emergency that might arise. General Arnold, Chief of the United States Army Air Forces, in his recent annual report summarized developments in various forms of warfare, and exhorted the American people to be fully prepared to wage atomic war with all the latest weapons. The idea that some weapons are too terrible to be

WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE

used is dismissed as sentimentalism. The military mind proceeds with the assumption that a nation must be prepared to use any weapon that may possibly be used by a potential enemy. Let us therefore consider the weapons which will be used if the nations stagger into a third world war.

General Arnold says that in any future aerial warfare, "Aircraft, piloted or pilotless, will move at speeds far beyond the velocity of sound, well over 700 miles per hour. Improvements in aerodynamics, propulsion, and electronic control will enable unmanned devices to transport means of destruction to targets at distances up to many thousands of miles . . . Small amounts of explosive materials, as in atomic bombs, will cause destruction of many square miles . . . We should be ready with a weapon of the general type of the German V-2 rocket, having greatly improved range and precision, and launched from great distances. V-2 is ideally suited to deliver atomic explosives, because effective defense against it would prove extremely difficult . . . We must be ready to launch them from unexpected directions. This can be done from true space ships, capable of operating outside the earth's atmosphere. The design of such a ship is all but practicable today; research will unquestionably bring it into being within the foreseeable future."

That these are not fantastic prophecies is indicated by the actual destruction wrought by German V-1 and V-2 rockets. A British expert has thus summarized the evidence: "In a period of 80 days and nights, the V-1 damaged nearly a million houses and caused thousands of casualties . . . The V-1 carried 1,870 pounds of explosive

a distance of 150 miles at a speed of 350 miles an hour . . . The V-2 rocket is a streamlined projectile 46 feet long, 5 feet, 6 inches in diameter . . . It has an explosive warhead of 2,000 pounds in the nose; and when it is filled with fuel the whole rocket weighs about 12 tons . . . its flight carries it to a height of 60 miles above the earth's surface . . . The maximum range at present is 220 miles . . . The range of the rocket can be increased up to some 2,500 miles without employing any new principles beyond those already introduced by the Germans."

In the event of another great war, rockets and airplanes loaded with atomic bombs will be launched from giant submarines 200 miles or even 1,000 miles off shore. Year by year bigger and bigger submarines will be manufactured, with substantially increased cruising range and moving at far more rapid speed. These huge submerged warriors can be loaded with flying missiles at remote spots and sent unseen to isolated points in the vast ocean within firing range of distant congested areas of population. From their decks airplanes can take flight and rockets can be hurled, winging their way through hundreds of miles of space and bringing destruction to cities and death to multitudes.

The British Government has announced that one of its secret weapons was a lead-alloy delayed-action fuse no bigger than a fountain pen. This fuse could be set to explode in one hour or in one month. Improvements of this fuse may be expected, with the result that atomic bombs could

be planted secretly weeks in advance of the time set for explosion.

Destruction by fire is certain to become more devastating within the near future. During the last few months of the war, the United States air forces were dropping vast quantities of "the practically unquenchable incendiary jelly napalm." Entire cities may be burned to the ground with huge supplies of improved incendiary jelly.

Dr. M. L. E. Oliphant, the leading British scientist in this field, has expressed the conviction that it may soon be possible to produce an atomic poison gas which, if used in and with an atomic bomb, would kill every living thing within a radius of 1,000 miles.⁸

The development of radio-controlled, rocket-driven missiles means that there is no adequate defense against atomic bombs. And soon it will be possible to increase the destructiveness of atomic bombs a thousand-fold. *Time* recently summarized the convictions of many scientists that "atomic weapons might kill 20% of a nation's people in an hour."⁹

With one accord leading scientists are saying there is no adequate defense against V-rockets loaded with atomic bombs. *We have entered a new era of destructiveness and the old argument that war is a lesser evil is tragic delusion.* War has become totalitarian and totalitarian war is a combination of all the worst evils which threaten the human race.

A nation's preparedness to wage atomic war will have disastrous effects upon its relations with other peoples, through increased suspicion, deeper fear, more bitter enmity, and counter-preparedness to

WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE

wage atomic war. So long as nations and alliances are frantically preparing to annihilate enemies with atomic energy, mutual aid in the solution of common problems on an adequate scale will be impossible. Effective forms of international government can never be operated so long as nations are preparing to wage war. The international mind and the international heart can never function adequately so long as the race of atomic armaments continues. Preparedness to wage war with these new weapons will perpetuate anarchy among the nations and will surely lead to a suicidal third world war if it is continued. It will be sheer madness to engage in a race of atomic armaments.

A nation's preparedness to wage atomic war will also have devastating consequences upon its own scale of values and code of morals. It will be morally paralyzing for America to prepare for the mass promiscuous killing of millions of human beings in Soviet Russia or in England or in some other land. If we indoctrinate the youth of our land with the idea that they must be ready to kill Russian or British wives and babies in order to protect their own families, we will thereby destroy the very foundations of high morality. All exalted concepts of morality are based on reverence for human life and recognition of human solidarity. A low estimate of the worth of human life is essential to the training of our young men in the science of human slaughter of Russian or British men, women and children with all the weapons of atomic war.

The spiritual effects of preparedness to massacre millions of human beings are even more appalling. Every basic doctrine of Christianity is

nullified to the degree that we accept the ideas and practices of atomic war: the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the inestimable value of human life, the kinship of all peoples, the duty and privilege of sympathy and compassion and affection, the responsibility of the strong to bear the burdens of the weak, the overcoming of evil with goodness, the redemptive power of self-giving forgiving love, the supremacy of spiritual forces over material might. We can take Jesus seriously and strive earnestly to follow him, or we can prepare to wage atomic war, but it is utterly impossible to do both at the same time.

The only defense against the ravages of atomic war is the prevention of that war through mutual aid in the solution of common problems under a reign of international law functioning through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual confidence.

CHAPTER II

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

Historical perspective makes it clear that if another world war is to be averted, nations must do certain things which hitherto they have not done, and nations must stop doing certain things which they have long been doing. The imperatives of peace are both positive and negative. New policies must be formed and new instruments forged. Old policies must be changed and old practices abandoned.

1. Friendly Relations With Soviet Russia.

This is the foremost requirement of world peace. If the United States and Soviet Russia do not fight, there is little likelihood of another world war in our time. If these two mighty powers can maintain friendly and cooperative relations, they will be able to lead the peoples of the earth into the ways of peace.

Mutual understanding is the foundation required for friendship and cooperation. Understanding must rest upon appreciative frankness and systematic plainness of speech. The citizens and governments of these two lands must open wide the channels of information. Secrecy and evasion and deceit bring forth suspicion and fear and enmity. Humility and penitence are urgently needed because arrogance and hypocrisy are provocative and divisive.

There is not the slightest necessity for war between these two countries. There is no "objective historical process" which makes inevitable war between these two peoples. No "vast interplay of imponderable forces" is leading inexorably to armed conflict. No "impersonal logic of events"

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

compels mutual efforts to annihilate. The Russians do not want to fight Americans and would gain nothing from such a war. The people of the United States do not want to fight the Russians and would not profit from such a combat. The leaders of both countries realize that a third world war would be utterly suicidal for all belligerents.

There is no necessity for war with Russia, but there is an alarming possibility that such a war will be fought. War does not come because people want to fight. War is not the result of careful financial calculations. War is the explosion of colliding policies. If the Russians insist upon maintaining certain attitudes and practices and if the Americans insist upon following contradictory procedures, the consequent incidents and crises will endanger the peace of the world. Therefore, it is imperative that we understand the dynamics of Soviet foreign policy.

(1) *The Communist conviction is that Soviet Russia must expect the continuing hostility of capitalist countries.* This passionate obsession is rooted in theory and nurtured in experience. The basic premise of Communists is that there can be no peace of justice until the exploiting class has been abolished. Since vested interests will not voluntarily relinquish privilege and power, the exploiters must be liquidated. This necessitates preparedness for victory in the class struggle. Thus Communist strategy includes violent seizure of power, establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, confiscation of private property, liquidation of recalcitrant opponents. These are looked upon as necessary temporary procedures. When a new generation has been trained in Communist

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

ways of living and all opposition has died out, the state will wither away, and peoples will dwell in freedom and goodwill. These fundamental Communist convictions remain essentially unchanged, in spite of the widespread delusion that Russia is abandoning communism and returning to capitalism.

An understanding of the intensity of this conviction about the irreconcilable conflict between Communism and capitalism is so essential that it should be well illustrated. Marx and Lenin are the ultimate authorities of Communists and their views should be quoted. Lenin wrote: "... it is Utopian to think that the proletariat will achieve its aim in a peaceful way. It is impossible to pass from capitalism to socialism without breaking national frameworks . . . There is no other way out, except a proletarian revolution . . . Capitalists are as incapable of sacrificing their interests as man is incapable of lifting himself by his own bootstraps . . . The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution . . . The deliverance of the oppressed class is impossible without a forcible revolution, and also without the destruction of the State machine which has been created by the ruling class . . . The dictatorship of the proletariat is a hard-fought fight against the forces and traditions of the old society; a fight that is both bloody and unbloody, both violent and passive, both military and economic, both educational and administrative . . . A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . The transition from capitalism to Communism will certainly

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

bring a great variety and abundance of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be only one: the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . it is not voting, but civil war that decides all serious questions of politics when history has placed the dictatorship of the proletariat on the order of the day."¹²

During the two decades since the death of Lenin, there has been only one supreme authority in Soviet Russia. Therefore listen to these words from Joseph Stalin: "Was Lenin right in contending that 'the dictatorship of the proletariat is the tap-root of the revolution?' Unquestionably he was right . . . For the proletarian revolution the seizure of power is only a beginning; power, when seized, is used as a lever for the transformation of the old economy and for the organization of a new one . . . the proletarian revolution means that the groups of exploiters one and all have been excluded from power, and that the leaders of all the workers, the leaders of all the exploited, the leader of the proletarian class, have come to occupy the seat of power, and they therefore have no option but to destroy the old State machine and replace it by a new one."¹⁴

In an interview with Foreign Workers' Delegations, November 5, 1927, Stalin said: "We are a country surrounded by capitalist States. The internal enemies of our Revolution are the agents of the capitalists of all countries. The capitalist States are the background and basis for the internal enemies of our Revolution. Fighting against the enemies at home we therefore fight the counter-revolutionary elements of all countries. Judge for yourselves whether under such conditions we can do

without such punitive organs as the G.P.U. The G.P.U. is necessary for the revolution and it will continue to live and strike terror into the hearts of the enemies of the proletariat:"

Lenin wrote: "We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars over the division of the spoils among the capitalists, but we have always considered it absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to disavow revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of socialism."¹⁵ On July 13, 1928, Stalin declared in an address to a Communist meeting in Leningrad: "The most popular method of lulling the working class and diverting it from the struggle against the danger of war is present-day pacifism, with its League of Nations, the gospel of 'peace,' the 'outlawry' of war, the nonsense about 'disarmament,' and so forth . . . pacifism is preached through the mouths of the Social-Democrats in order the more successfully to prepare for new wars . . . From this follow the duties of the Communist Parties: Firstly, to carry on an incessant struggle against Social-Democracy along every line, both economic and political, including the exposure of every form of pacifism, with the object of winning over the majority of the working class."¹⁶

The Communist International in 1928 declared: "The overthrow of capitalism is impossible without violence, i.e., without armed uprisings and wars against the bourgeoisie. In our era of imperialistic wars and world revolution, revolutionary civil wars of the proletarian dictatorship against the bourgeoisie, wars of the proletariat against the bourgeois states and world capitalism, as well as national revolutionary wars of op-

pressed peoples against imperialism are unavoidable.”¹⁷

In the United States the most powerful Communist is William Z. Foster, the party's candidate for President of the United States and long its guiding spirit. Recently he brought about the expulsion of Earl Browder as General Secretary. Back in 1932 Mr. Foster wrote a book entitled, *Toward Soviet America*, from which these quotations are taken: “The road to this social development can only be opened by revolution. This is because the question of power is involved. The capitalist class, like an insatiable blood-sucker, hangs to the body of the toiling masses and can be dislodged only by force . . . The capitalists will not give up of their own accord; nor can they be talked, bought or voted out of power . . . To put an end to the capitalist system will require a consciously revolutionary act by the great toiling masses, led by the Communist party; that is, the conquest of the State power, the destruction of the State machine created by the ruling class, and the organization of the proletarian dictatorship . . . War is inevitable under the capitalist system . . . So long as capitalism lasts war must continue to curse the human race. It is the historical task of the proletariat to put an end to this hoary monster. This it will do by destroying the capitalist system and with it the economic causes that bring about war.”¹⁸

War is inevitable under the capitalist system! War can be abolished only through the dictatorship of the proletariat! Here are the twin pillars upon which the international strategy and tactics of Communism are erected. These ideas may be

invalid, or they may be sound, but there can be no understanding of the foreign policy of Soviet Russia apart from the realization that they constitute a fixed obsession with the leaders of that land. Throughout their revolutionary careers they have been nurtured on the conviction that an inherent and irreconcilable conflict prevails between Communism and capitalism.

Theory has been undergirded by experience. Soviet leaders are thoroughly convinced that the basic ideas of Communist theory have been proved valid by the course of events. Not only did the Bolsheviks fight against invading armies and against the armed forces of counter-revolution, but for a long decade their experience was that of despised outcasts who were feared and hated. It is easy for outsiders to forget what Communist leaders remember only too well that Lenin and Trotsky and Stalin were denounced and villified as extremely in England and France and the United States as later Mussolini and Hitler were cursed and execrated. Fear of bolshevism was deep and pervasive. The press of other lands was filled with wild distortions of events in Russia, and no story was too fantastic or diabolical to be printed. Statesmen and publicists and clergymen in other countries with voice and pen poured out a torrent of contemptuous and villainous abuse upon Soviet leaders.

Concerning this early period, Walter Duranty writes: "Abroad, the Bolshevik position could hardly have been worse, and it is no exaggeration to say that Allied leaders regarded the Bolsheviks with loathing and dismay. The reason for this hostility was not only the instinctive repugnance of a

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

capitalist and class society towards the 'Red' regime; but the profound conviction that Lenin had been a German tool from the outset, and that he was determined to 'betray' the Western Powers by concluding a separate peace. When later he did so, Allied fury knew no bounds. All the weapons and devices of their powerful propaganda services were put in action against the Bolsheviks. They had nationalized women, violated the sanctity of the Home, involved in common destruction the temples of God and the money-changers—no charge true or false was too extravagant for Allied hatred to employ and Allied panic to disseminate. Since the days of Attila and his Huns, no leader had been so execrated as Lenin, no people so vilified as the Russians."²⁰

Winston Churchill in the House of Commons, on November 25, 1925, spoke of "the dark power of Moscow" where "we have a band of cosmopolitan conspirators gathered from the underworlds of the great cities of Europe and America in despotic possession of still great resources." Twelve years later on April 14, 1937, Mr. Churchill was still saying "I will not pretend that, if I had to choose between Communism and Nazism, I would choose Communism." Many a prominent British and French and American leader proclaimed the conviction that Mussolini and Hitler were bulwarks against the tides of Communism.

Soviet Russia's diplomatic isolationism was in the early days imposed from without by an Allied quarantine. Russian representatives were not invited to many important gatherings. The Treaty of Versailles was signed by Liberia and Honduras but not by Soviet Russia. As late as the notorious

Munich conference Soviet representatives were not invited. In 1927 Great Britain broke off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. The diplomatic recognition of USSR by the United States did not take place until 1933, fifteen years after the Bolsheviks came into power. Not until 1934 was Soviet Russia received into the League of Nations, and at the end of 1939 the same Soviet Russia was expelled from membership in the League. As the nations drifted swiftly toward the precipice in 1939, Stalin made a bitter attack upon England and France "who seek to drag the Soviet Union into war with Germany."

When Soviet Russia invaded Finland at the end of 1939, Winston Churchill cried out: "Everyone can see how Communism rots the soul of a nation, how it makes it abject and hungry in peace, and proves it base, abominable in war."²¹ Early in 1940 Great Britain and France seriously planned war against the Soviet Union. Mr. Dallin writes: "War between the Allies and Soviet Russia, either in Finland or through the Caucasus seemed inevitable . . . There is hardly any doubt but that, had the Russo-Finnish conflict lasted another month, the Soviets would have become involved in an open military conflict with the Western Powers."²² President Roosevelt proclaimed a "moral embargo" against Russia covering airplanes, aeronautical equipment, materials essential to airplane manufacture, and facilities for producing high quality aviation gasoline. This embargo remained in force from December 2, 1939 to January 21, 1941.

Recollection of this background makes it easier to understand why Stalin entered into an alliance with Hitler, providing him with invaluable sup-

plies of war and taking control of a substantial proportion of Poland's territory. Vivid memory also helps us to understand why Soviet Russia and Japan signed a neutrality treaty on April 13, 1941, four months after the attack at Pearl Harbor.

(2) *To understand the attitudes and actions of the Soviet Government, we must realize that Stalin and his comrades are convinced that for nearly thirty years they have been waging defensive war to protect the Land of Socialism.* Their seizure of power in Russia was accomplished with a bare minimum of violence, contrary to their theories. The fighting took place later in defending their regime. Just a week after the March revolution had deposed the Czar, Lenin wrote from Switzerland: "How could such a 'miracle' happen, that in eight days . . . a monarchy that had maintained itself for centuries, and continued to maintain itself during three years of tremendous national class conflicts of 1905-1907, could utterly collapse? . . . Let us not harbour any illusions. The fact that the revolution succeeded so quickly and, apparently, at the first superficial glance, so 'radically,' is due to an unusual historical conjuncture where there combined, in a strikingly 'favourable' manner, absolutely dissimilar movements, absolutely different class interests, absolutely opposed political and social tendencies."²⁴ Two weeks later Lenin wrote: "We know full well that the proletariat of Russia is less organized, less prepared, and less class-conscious than the proletariat of other countries. It is not its special qualities but rather the special coincidence of historical circumstances that had made the proletariat of Rus-

sia for a certain, perhaps very short time, the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world."²⁵ After his arrival in Petrograd, on April 27, 1917, Lenin said: "And so, the revolution in its first stage developed in a way that no one had expected . . . A most amazingly unique situation."²⁶ So much so that H. N. Brailsford writes: "Lenin, as one of his intimates told me, believed, when he made the November revolution, that he was lighting the beacon for the rising of the German working-class: his own experiment would last, he supposed, at the most four months."²⁷

Near the end of his classic history, Trotsky writes: "Notwithstanding the number of great social and political crises, a coincidence of all the conditions necessary to a victorious and stable proletarian revolution has so far occurred but once in history: in Russia in October 1917."²⁸ But once in history!

The Bolshevik revolution succeeded because of the following "coincidence and conjuncture:" The extent of the revolution against czarist tyranny, the catastrophic defeat of Russia in war, the appalling degree of economic misery, the absence of a large propertied middle class, the melting away of armed support of the old regime, the lack of experience with democracy, the madness of the Kerensky Government's attempt to continue the World War, the enormous popular support accorded the Communists, the limited growth of industrialism and the high degree of economic self-sufficiency of the vast land of Russia, the genius and faith of Lenin plus the eloquence and organizing ability of Trotsky.

The melting away of armed support of the old

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

regime followed as a natural consequence of the ghastly suffering of the masses and the intensity of their resentment. Both in the March revolution and in that of November the transfer of power was practically bloodless. At the former date none of the armed forces remained sufficiently loyal to the Czar to be willing to fight in his behalf, while at the latter time the Bolsheviks took power from Kerensky after brief and feeble armed resistance. The significance of this dual fact can scarcely be exaggerated. In both cases the revolutionaries succeeded precisely because they were confronted with practically no armed resistance.

The enormous popular support accorded the Communists was due to the despair and resentment of the masses against all other alternatives and to the glowing promises made by Lenin, Trotsky and their colleagues. To the soldiers they promised immediate peace, to the peasants they held out the immediate expectation of receiving land, to the proletarians they offered control of industry and domination of government, and to non-Russian citizens of the empire, they offered freedom and self-determination.

"It was not necessary to employ force," wrote Trotsky, who was chief director of the October revolution, "for there was no resistance. The insurrectionary masses lifted their elbows and pushed out the lords of yesterday."²⁹ The bourgeois classes had expected barricades, flaming conflagrations, looting, rivers of blood. In reality a silence reigned more terrible than all the thunders of the world."

In Moscow the insurrection required eight days before all opposition was crushed, although the

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

revolutionaries outnumbered their opponents by ten to one, according to Maralov, one of the chief leaders of the Moscow insurrection.³⁰ The fact is now indelibly recorded in history that the Petrograd insurrection required just 24 hours and was practically bloodless, and that the Moscow insurrection took just eight days, with relatively small loss of life.

The Bolsheviks were able to seize power practically without violence, but the new order was defended with fierce fighting against foreign armies, counter-revolutionists and class enemies. The invading armies included contingents of Czechs, Poles, Japanese, Turks, British, French and Americans. Bitter fighting took place against the armies of Kornilov, Denikin, Kolchak, and Wrangel for more than two years. Atrocities on an appalling scale were perpetrated on both sides of the conflict. The Bolsheviks made extensive use of the Cheka, the dread secret police. The White terror and the Red terror combined to destroy a vast number of victims. The ruthlessness of this conflict colored all the subsequent thinking of the Communist leaders. They never forgot that simultaneously they had waged international and civil war. From those terrible years to the present day, their domestic and foreign policies have constituted a strategy of defending Soviet Russia from internal and external enemies.

In wartime governments exalt the law of military necessity, they do that which is necessary in order to achieve victory. Generals and admirals give commands to kill and to continue killing as long as necessary to win the war. Property is destroyed to the extent necessary. Spies are used and

every available form of deception is resorted to without regard to morality. In wartime governments tell as many lies to their own people as they consider necessary in order to maintain national morale and to strengthen the will to fight. The prevailing code is simple: that is right which helps to win the war, that is wrong which stands in the way of victory. Army commanders do not raise moral questions when they bomb a great city like Dresden into obliteration and kill or wound 250,000 men, women and children. The only military justification needed for the atomic annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was evidence that these atrocities brought the war to an end more quickly and made triumph more complete. Callous disregard of human life is required by military necessity. Sacrifice as many of our own men and kill as many of the enemy as necessary.

The leaders of Soviet Russia have long been convinced that they are engaged in a war to the death with capitalistic countries. "For over two decades Soviet foreign policy had been based on two assumptions: the inevitability of another world war and the dogmatic belief that this war must be anti-Soviet in character—a coalition of the world's 'capitalist powers' against Soviet Russia," writes David J. Dallin.³¹ Their strategy and tactics therefore have been those deemed necessary to defend their country from foes within and without. The wartime law of military necessity has guided their behavior throughout these years. That the end justifies the means has seemed as axiomatic to them as to any military commander confronted with powerful enemies. They have killed when they believed killing to be necessary; they have impri-

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

soned and exiled when these measures were considered necessary; they have liquidated opponents on the vast scale believed to be necessary. They have behaved as other men behave when they are engaged in war.

Lenin wrote: "*Morality is that which serves the destruction of the old exploiter's society and the union of all the toilers around the proletariat, which creates a new society of Communists. Communist morality is that which serves this struggle, which unites the toilers against any exploitation . . . We do not believe in eternal morality and we expose the deceit of all legends about morality.*"³²

In an address to the Russian Young Communist League, on October 2, 1920, Lenin said: "In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality? In the sense that they were preached by the bourgeoisie, who declared that ethics were God's commandments. We, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiter's interests . . . We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts . . . We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality is deduced from the class struggle of the proletariat."

Lenin also wrote: "When a revolutionary class struggles against the propertied classes, which resist it, it must crush this resistance; and we will suppress the resistance of the propertied with the same means by which the propertied suppress the proletariat; other means have not been invented."³³

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

In his famous letter to American workers in 1918, Lenin wrote: "The bourgeoisie of international imperialism killed ten million and mutilated twenty million human beings in 'its' war, a war to decide whether British or German robbers should rule the whole world. If our war, the war of the oppressed and exploited against the oppressors and exploiters, will cost half a million or a million victims in all countries, the bourgeoisie will say that the former sacrifices were justified, the latter criminal. The proletariat will say something quite different."³⁴

In 1920 Lenin wrote: "We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, veiling of truth."³⁵

The nature of Communist policy is illustrated by Lenin's comment on the offer of the Allies in February, 1918, to help the Bolsheviks, on condition that the latter would resume war against Germany. Lenin preferred peace with Germany, but if he could not obtain that he was willing to accept help from Britain, France and the United States. Thus Lenin described the agreement he made with the French representative, Count de Lubersac: "We shook each other's hand, I and the French monarchist, aware that each one of us would readily hang his partner. But our interests coincided . . . Against the advance of the predatory Germans we utilized the equally predatory counterinterests of other imperialists. We resorted to maneuvering, dodging, falling back, which are obligatory in all wars, while waiting for the moment when the international revolution finally ripens."³⁶

Lady Astor in the summer of 1931 inquired bluntly of Stalin: "How long are you going to

continue killing people?" With equal bluntness, Stalin replied: "As long as it is necessary."⁸⁷

The evidence permits no other conclusion: *the leaders of Soviet Russia have long been acting as military commanders act when confronting formidable enemies in wartime.* They have been guided by the law of necessity, they have done what they considered necessary at every step of the way. In diplomacy as well as at the military front they have resorted to maneuvers, advancing, retreating, dodging, concealing, deceiving. They have sought to defend Communism and the Soviet Union in all the ways at their disposal. Through all these years they have shared the conviction expressed by Lenin in 1920: "We have now passed from war to peace. But we have not forgotten that war will come again. So long as both capitalism and socialism remain, we cannot live in peace. Either the one or the other in the long run will conquer. *There will be a funeral chant either for the Soviet Republic or for world capitalism.* This is a moratorium in a war."⁸⁸ Moratorium! Funeral chant!

Soviet leaders have waged the class war with weapons used by other peoples against national enemies in international war. To Communists war is war and enemies are enemies, whether the conflict is class war or international war and whether the foes are class enemies or national enemies. When the decision was made to collectivize the farms in order to strengthen the Soviet Union, opponents of this measure were liquidated by execution and imprisonment and exile, even though the number of victims ran into millions. Millions are killed in international war and millions have been

killed or exiled to penal labor in Soviet Russia. The Bolshevik attitude toward these killings is substantially the same as national patriotism's attitude toward killing enemies in wartime, regrettable but necessary.

"We will retain our penal system in all its ruthlessness, our repressions, our measures of suppression against the class enemy," declared Postyshev in 1931 in behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The extent and severity of this ruthlessness is described by David J. Dallin in a chapter on "Forced Labor," from which we quote: "In 1928, as far as can be established, the class of forced labor was about 30,000; in 1930, about 650,000; and in 1934-35 it was probably between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000. These numbers continued to grow, in some years quite rapidly.³¹ They included: first, ordinary criminals, formerly maintained in prisons; second, kulaks, whose numbers were particularly large between 1929 and 1934; third, participants in peasant mutinies, which at times had swept entire regions, and all of whose inhabitants suffered exile; fourth, 'counterrevolutionists,' i.e., members of non-Communist parties and sympathizers; fifth, Communist-oppositionists, who comprise a very large number of exiles, particularly in the period of the great purge of 1936-38; sixth, national groups, exiled as a whole as a preventive measure, such as Soviet citizens of Polish nationality in the middle 'thirties (after Poland's *reapproachment* with Germany); this category also included Germans (Soviet citizens) exiled from various regions of European Russia and Siberia, especially after the beginning of the Russo-German war. Added to the categories of exiles

mentioned were 'socially hostile elements' in the newly occupied regions in 1939-40. Over 1,000,000 were exiled from eastern Poland and hundreds of thousands from the Baltic States and Bessarabia. In addition there was the systematic exile of the population residing along the frontiers, as on the Finnish border, and from many places along the Polish border; in other places, too, where fortifications were in the course of construction, tens of thousands of civilians were driven to the east and north."³⁹

This vast penal community is governed by the NKVD, successor of the old secret police OGPU and previously the Cheka. The NKVD is authorized "to order without trial expulsions, exile, and imprisonment in Corrective Labor Camps for a period of not more than five years." This huge reservoir of prison labor has been used in lumber camps, in the digging of canals and in the construction of highways. In 1944 Mr. Dallin wrote: "The forced labor class, the exact extent of which is not known, and the number of which has fluctuated at frequent intervals, may be estimated at from seven to twelve million."⁴⁰

For twenty years Joseph Stalin has exercised absolute control of party machinery and therefore of the Soviet Government. Opposition to his leadership has been answered with liquidation. After Lenin's death in 1924, there were seven members of the all-powerful Political Bureau. Four of them were shot after treason trials—Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Bukharin. Suicide was chosen by Tomsky. Later Trotsky was murdered in Mexico, following his banishment. Thus Stalin was left with absolute and undisputed power.⁴¹

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

Concerning the Great Purge in 1937-38, Walter Duranty has written: "The death roll ran into thousands, the number of exiles to hundreds of thousands. These figures cannot be controlled, but it is known that from two-thirds to three-quarters of the leading personalities in Soviet Russia were 'purged,' that is, expelled from the Party and in many cases executed. It was no longer a purge or cleansing, as the Party had known them before, but a panic madness which struck right and left almost haphazard. The statistics are appalling: Two-thirds of the Soviet diplomatic corps—ambassadors, ministers, and counselors of embassy or legation—were 'liquidated,' that is their execution was announced, or they simply disappeared. Casualties were equally severe in the Army and Navy leadership. It is sufficient to say that of the eight officers of the highest rank who were called as extra judges in the trial of Tukhachevsky and the Generals in June, 1937, only one, Marshal Budenny, survived. The others were liquidated except the Cossack commander, Gorbachev, who died in his bed. Of the Council of Commissars, numbering twenty-one at the end of 1936, only five were left two years later. One, Orjonikidze, died, and the rest were shot or disappeared. In the Central Committee of the Communist Party there were seventy-one members elected at the beginning of 1934. At the end of 1938 twenty-one remained active: three died naturally; one, Kirov, was assassinated; thirty-six disappeared; one, Marshal Gamarnik, committed suicide; nine were announced as shot."⁴²

(3) *Through indoctrination, propaganda and censorship, the basic ideas of Communist strategy have been embedded in the Russian public mind.*

All of the Russians who are thirty-five years of age and younger have been reared in conflict and nurtured on propaganda, propaganda in the sense of one-sided and distorted presentations. One must hasten to say that Communists in Russia have had no monopoly of the use of propaganda. This generation all over the earth has been drowned in oceans of it. But the Soviet authorities have used indoctrination and propaganda and censorship with more thoroughness over a longer time than has been true in any other land.

For nearly three decades the Communist dictatorship has exercised almost absolute control over education, the press, the platform, the pulpit, the publication of books and magazines, the movies and the radio. History and contemporary events alike have been interpreted in terms of the class struggle and Communist strategy. Travel to other countries has been severely restricted, and a Russian incurs suspicion if he becomes too intimate with one of the few foreigners in his own country. The Russian people are isolated and their thinking controlled to a degree which cannot be understood in the United States.

Books from other lands are translated and published in Soviet Russia, books which describe the sordid side of life in capitalistic countries. The works of Upton Sinclair have had an enormous circulation in Russia. Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* has been presented as a true picture of life in America. The Soviet press constantly refers to lynchings, race riots, crimes, divorces, exploitation, industrial conflict, the domination of the workers by the bosses, and other vicious phases of American life. The mechanical efficiency of Amer-

ican industry is praised but scarcely a good word is ever said about economic, racial and political behavior in the United States.

The cumulative evidence is convincing: the Communist conviction is that Soviet Russia must expect the continuing hostility of capitalist countries; Stalin and his comrades are convinced that for thirty years they have been waging defensive war to protect the Land of Socialism; through indoctrination, propaganda and censorship, the basic ideas of Communist strategy have been embedded in the Russian public mind.

The fundamental premises of Lenin and Stalin remain essentially unchanged. In 1944 David Dallin wrote: "A great deal has changed in Russia during the past quarter of a century. But the government has never abandoned the two basic principles: state economy and the strong totalitarian political regime."⁴³ In 1945 Edmund Stevens wrote: "Politically the power and prestige of the Communist Party is higher in Russia today than it has been in its whole history. Meanwhile, though the Comintern has been abolished officially, though religion has received some leeway and Soviet life seems likely to evolve toward ever more and more freedom, the official State philosophy is still Marxism-Leninism, not one of whose doctrines has ever been officially repudiated or revised. Of late, in particular, there has been a notable tendency to stress the importance of theory."⁴⁴ Upon returning to Soviet Russia in 1945, Edgar Snow wrote: "Nothing had been done or said which suggested any intention of abandoning the main body of Marxist-Leninist teachings as the foundation of the state. Much had recently happened to indicate that

the study of historical materialism would be emphasized in future training, even more than in the past."⁴⁵

Many changes are taking place inside the Soviet Union and many changes are occurring in Communist tactics outside Soviet Russia, but no basic change has been made in Communist strategy. To understand the behavior of Soviet leaders we must realize that they are as strongly committed as ever to two all-important elements in their faith: the dictatorship of the proletariat wielded by the Communist Party in the name of the workers, and absolute control of all economic life by the State administered by the Communist Party. These utterly decisive policies have not been changed. Nothing is being done to weaken the power of the Communist Party, which itself is utterly dominated by the eleven members of the all-powerful Political Bureau, who are themselves controlled and directed by Joseph Stalin.

The paradox of change and no change is illustrated by governmental policy concerning religion. Tactics have changed but not strategy. The Orthodox Church has been permitted, after many years of refusal, to elect a Patriarch. Permission has been granted to open a theological seminary, to print Bibles, prayer books and liturgical books and to give religious instruction in homes and churches. Students in the theological seminary are paid a monthly allowance of 200 rubles by the government and get "essential worker" rations. The Peoples Commissars have established a new Bureau on Affairs of the Greek Orthodox Church. Thus control of the Church is as complete as before. The Communist Party no longer fears the Church

and now prefers to make use of it. The Orthodox Church of Russia is now making vigorous efforts to control the Orthodox Church in the United States. This part of the story was told in *The Christian Century*, January 2, 1946. Control of the Church by the State is an ancient tale. But no Czar ever exercised more complete control than does the Political Bureau and its subordinate agencies. Mr. Edgar Snow is a sympathetic interpreter of Soviet Russia, but in 1945 he concluded an illuminating chapter on religion by saying: "Let no one imagine, however, that the State has made any concession to religion as a separate power or authority in secular life . . . The truth is that the Church is no longer 'the agency of the former ruling class;' it is the obedient 'agency' of the proletarian state. The Government looks upon the Church more benignly now because it can without fear employ it as an organization amenable to its political will, and helpful in the conquest of the last islands of opposition left in the populace. The Kremlin also fully realizes the usefulness of the Patriarchate and the Synod in reconciling Slav-Orthodox elements in the neighbor states of Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and to a lesser extent in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, in its struggles against the Vatican for moral ascendancy in Europe."⁴⁶

An illuminating interpretation by Professor George P. Fedotov appeared recently in *Christianity and Crisis*, edited by Reinhold Niebuhr. After describing how the Soviet Union makes use of the Church, Professor Fedotov writes: "Thus, internal and external, the Patriarchate of Moscow serves the Soviet State, supporting it wholeheartedly in war and peace, in defense and ag-

gression, seeing in this collaboration a national duty and, obviously sharing an age-long Byzantine-Muscovite conviction that serving the National State is the best way of serving the Kingdom of God . . . For more than two decades, particularly since Sergius came to leadership (1928), the GPU did an effective work of purge or negative selection with the Church. All pure, courageous, independent leaders of the clergy, one after another, year after year, were removed, imprisoned, exiled, often shot. The weakest survived . . . It is very characteristic of the new leadership of the Church that all big names in it—Sergius, Alexius, Benjamin—belong to the Episcopate of Czarist times, and that of the right orientation (Benjamin, of the extreme right). For them subservience to the absolute state is normal behavior.”⁴⁷

The organ of the Young Communists on September 17, 1944, said bluntly: “Our party’s attitude toward religion is well known and has not changed.” No change in strategy, but frequent changes in tactics, inside the Soviet Union and in foreign relations with other powers.

The meaning of all this is clear: *if a third world war is to be averted, the American people and government must behave in ways that will reduce the suspicions and fears and enmities of the people and government of Soviet Russia.* And quickly we must say also that the Soviet Union must behave in ways that will reduce suspicion and fear in the United States. This book, however, will not be read in Soviet Russia and therefore it would be futile to advise and admonish the Russians. We Americans can be effective in helping to change Soviet policy by behaving in ways that will convince

them that a pacific foreign policy is preferable to a belligerent one.

It will be fatal if American policy is determined by fear, fear of an atomic invasion by Russian armed forces, and fear of a Communist armed revolution in the United States. *If we are guided by fear, we will act in ways that will increase the provocativeness of the Russians and will thereby find justification for our fear.* And if we stumble into an atomic war against the Soviet Union, our conviction that the conflict is a war of self-defense will not save us from mutual suicide. Even if the Russians should be totally wrong and we should be utterly right, armed action could not save our cities from obliteration and our people from slaughter. If war should come there will be no defense from atomic bombs, bombs from V-rockets, bombs from planes in the stratosphere, bombs sent by plane or missile from the decks of giant submarines hundreds of miles off shore, bombs secretly planted by Russian agents in metropolitan centers of population. Let the incontestable fact be burned into consciousness: *the only defense against atomic bombs is the prevention of war.* Reduction of suspicion, fear and enmity is an imperative requirement of the maintenance of peace. Therefore, we must behave in ways that will increase mutual aid, mutual understanding and mutual confidence. This is the only road to security.

The way to prevent Communist revolution and violent seizure of power in the United States is to adopt policies which will provide full employment at adequate wages and salaries and thereby maintain prosperity at a high level. This can be done in ways outlined in another section of this

book. If this is done, the chance of violent revolution will be reduced to less than one in a hundred.

In subsequent sections I have outlined what seems to me to be a constructive foreign policy and a sound domestic program. Stalin and his comrades have been constantly in mind as these paragraphs were written. I am not advocating "an appeasement policy" in relation to Russia, if by appeasement is meant yielding passively to Russia on all crucial issues and refraining from the expression of critical judgments of Soviet procedure. A conciliatory and reconciling policy must be based on appreciative frankness and sympathetic plainness of speech.

Some friends have expressed apprehension that this section in which I have attempted an interpretation of Communist strategy will itself create suspicion and fear of Soviet Russia. The question has been raised seriously whether or not I am reflecting lack of confidence in the leaders of the Soviet Union, the very lack of confidence which makes impossible the maintenance of cordial and cooperative relations. To which the reply is made that the primary issue involved seems to me to be that of accuracy of interpretation. If my interpretation of Communist strategy is essentially unsound then this section really is provocative and unjustifiable. But if I have correctly summarized the Communist conviction (based on theory and experience) that Soviet Russia must expect the continuing hostility of capitalist countries, and if I am justified by the facts in saying that Stalin and his comrades are convinced that for nearly thirty years they have been waging defensive war to protect the Soviet Union, and if I am warranted in maintaining

that Communist theory includes the basic idea of an irreconcilable conflict between capitalism and Communism, then surely unvarnished words about the ideas and actions of Stalin and his comrades are not a manifestation of lack of confidence. It would be a lack of confidence to say that war between the United States and Soviet Russia is inevitable and cannot possibly be averted. It would be lack of confidence to say that there is no possibility of goodwill and cooperation between the peoples of these lands. My point of view can be stated bluntly: war between these two mighty nations will come unless—; but such a war is in no sense necessary and may be averted if—. Clear understanding of the attitudes and ideas and policies of Soviet leaders is absolutely necessary if this suicidal war is to be averted. If the American people and government stumble along in the dark concerning Soviet motives and actions, in some critical hour of collision our leaders may be so outraged and fearful that they will precipitate war by provocative behavior. In acquiring this clear understanding, candor is essential. Therefore, let us have more appreciative frankness and more sympathetic plainness of speech!

(2) *International Government.*

An examination of the Charter of the United Nations Organization is an appropriate way to emphasize the significance of international government.⁴⁸ The chief agencies of the UNO are the General Assembly, the Security Council, and International Court of Justice. Every member has one vote in the Assembly. There are eleven members of the Security Council, five of them being

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

permanent members: China, France, Great Britain, Soviet Russia and the United States. The Assembly may discuss any questions within the scope of the Charter, and may make recommendations on any such questions, except matters being considered by the Security Council. The Assembly may consider and discuss, investigate and recommend, but all the decisive powers of action are wielded by the Security Council. On all questions except procedural matters, the Security Council cannot act until there are seven favorable votes including all five votes of the permanent members. This means that any one of the Big Five can veto action, except that in cases where a permanent member is a party to a dispute it cannot veto efforts to bring about a *pacific* settlement. But even when a permanent member is a party to a dispute, it can veto the use of sanctions or forcible measures against itself. ,

All important decisions concerning the use of sanctions or forcible measures are in the hands of the Security Council which can act in these matters only when there is unanimity on the part of all five permanent members. Restraining action can never be taken against one of the Big Five or against any ally or protege or special friend of one of them. It is extremely unlikely that sanctions will be invoked against a weak and friendless nation because other effective means are available. The UNO is not authorized to decide policies in relation to the defeated powers, Germany and Italy and Japan, that power being wielded independently by the United States, Soviet Russia and Great Britain, and to a lesser degree France and China. *Therefore, there is only a remote possibility*

that armed sanctions will ever be used by the Security Council.

Thus it is obvious that the Security Council cannot provide security against aggressive actions on the part of the Big Five or from aggression by some other country being supported by one of the permanent members. This means that the security promised in Articles 42-49 is a snare and delusion. If security is obtained in the face of aggression, it will come from the pacific settlement of the dispute or from *national* armed action, not from the use of "international police" under control of the UNO. So long as the veto power is retained, the ink used in printing the sections about armed sanctions will remain wasted ink.

There is not the slightest possibility that in the near future the Communist leaders of Soviet Russia will place their reliance in the armed power of capitalist countries. Too long have they been schooled in the theory and experience of the class struggle, too intensely do they believe that war is inevitable so long as capitalist exploitation continues, to place their arms in a collective pool and be willing to abide by the decisions of an international body in which they are unable to exercise a protective veto.

Moreover, Great Britain and the United States are likewise unwilling to place themselves at the mercy of armed force which they do not control. It is unthinkable at the present stage that the Senate would consent to an arrangement whereby this country would place part of its army, navy and air force at the disposal of an international body in which our representative could be outvoted by delegates from other nations.

That is to say, we are now in the stage when no great power will trust an international body to decide when armed power is to be used and against whom it is to be directed. Consequently, it is futile to expect the Big Five to be willing to give up the right to veto the use of international armed action. So long as faith in armed action persists, it will be faith in a nation's armed power plus the armed strength of its allies. There is therefore no security whatever in collective armed power.

Collective security is, of course, the only kind of security, but not collective *armed* security. Especially is this true since the discovery of the atomic bomb. The suggestion is being made that all atomic bombs be turned over to the United Nations Organization. If this could actually be done, it would be a certain way to guarantee that atomic bombs would never be used, because it would be impossible to obtain agreement concerning their use. If there is unanimity among the Big Five there will be no need to drop atomic bombs anywhere at any time. If the great powers are divided, the UNO would be unable to use atomic bombs. Here is an incontestable truth; neither Soviet Russia or Great Britain or the United States would be willing to permit decisions about the use of atomic bombs to be made by an international body in which their own nation could be outvoted. So long as the idea of collective *armed* security persists, the veto power will be retained.

There is a possibility, however, that an international organization could be created and empowered to make decisions about the use of atomic bombs and other sanctions by majority vote and without a single nation being able to veto this

action. Such an organization would necessarily be confined in membership to those nations with sufficient mutual trust to cause them to delegate such power to a collective organization. Mr. Clarence K. Streit in his book *Union Now*⁵¹ suggested the following as charter members of the proposed Union: United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Ireland, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, the Swiss Confederation, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. Such a Union might be able to make collective decisions about the use of atomic bombs, but it could never provide security, for the simple reason that the nations not included would continue to depend upon their own atomic bombs and those of their allies.

It would be difficult to devise a procedure that would more certainly and more quickly precipitate a third world war than to create an armed Union which does not include Soviet Russia. Such action would prove to the Communist leaders the soundness of their conviction that Soviet Russia must expect the continued hostility of the capitalist powers. It is important therefore to emphasize the fact that the supporters of Union Now have in mind a vast pooling of the armed power of its members. "The Union government," writes Mr. Streit, "shall have the same limited but effective powers as the U. S. government, notably: To make war and peace for all its members, to govern their foreign relations and their non-self-governing territory, to provide them a common defense force

...
"52

The backers of Union Now stress the potential universality of the proposed Union. Soviet Russia

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

and all other nations will be welcomed as soon as they fulfill the conditions of membership. But one has only to glance at these conditions to recognize the fact that Soviet Russia would be compelled to abandon the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to be eligible. Part I, Article 1, of the illustrative constitution, reads: "In the individual freedom this Constitution is made to secure we include: 1. Freedom of speech and of the press and of conscience. 2. Freedom to organize ourselves for any purpose except to change by violence this Constitution and the laws made under it; freedom to assemble peaceably and to ask redress of grievances and make proposals. 3. Freedom of our persons, dwellings, communications, papers and effects from unreasonable searches and seizures . . ." ⁵³ The proposal is that citizens of nations entering the Union would automatically become citizens of the Union. That is to say, if Soviet Russia became a member, all citizens of that land would enjoy the privileges open to the citizens of the United States or any other member country, including free trade and uniform currency throughout the extent of the Union. ⁵⁴

To be eligible for membership in the Union, therefore, Soviet Russia would be compelled to abandon the dictatorship of the proletariat, disband the all-power NKVD secret police, pool their arms with those of capitalist countries and permit decisions concerning the use of this collective armed power to be made by majority vote. Consequently, it is obvious that this course of action will not be taken by Soviet Russia. On the contrary, the formation of such an armed Union would be considered by Communist leaders as a

INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENT

declaration of economic and political war against Soviet Russia. They would be confirmed in their most extreme fears that their nation must expect the continuation of unrelenting hostility from a coalition of capitalist powers. Confronted with such an ominous threat, they would strengthen dictatorship, increase the power of the secret police, tighten the censorship, intensify propaganda, and endeavor in every possible way to increase the power, military and economic and political power of Soviet Russia. All over the earth the policy of Soviet Russia would clash with the policy of the new Union—in Central and Southeastern Europe, in the Near East, in China, Korea and Japan. This world-wide struggle for power would compel members of the Union to concentrate upon preparedness for totalitarian atomic war. No inclusive international government could be formed. The best that could be hoped for would be an armistice before the suicidal war begins. *It would be sheer madness to create an armed Union which does not include Soviet Russia in its membership.*

Any Union that includes Soviet Russia in its membership will permit the right of veto of armed action. If the veto is not permitted, Soviet Russia will not accept membership. If you exclude Russia or if you include Russia, there is no security in collective *armed* security.

This judgment is confirmed by history. Armed coercion may be used effectively by a local government against criminals or against gangs of criminals, but inter-city government and inter-state government do not resort to armed action against cities and states, although they sometimes take

such action against individuals. When a municipality breaks state laws it is dealt with in other ways than by bombardment of the city hall. The Federal Government never uses or even threatens to use high explosive against a state capitol.

The Supreme Court of the United State has never attempted to use coercion as a means of securing observance of its decisions against states, in spite of repeated refusals to abide by its decisions on the part of various states. In 1792 an individual named Chisholm sued the State of Georgia and was awarded a judgment by the Supreme Court. Whereupon the Legislature of Georgia not only refused to pay the money due but passed a law declaring that any person attempting to enforce the Court's decision would be "guilty of felony" and would "suffer death by being hanged." What did the Supreme Court do in the face of this insubordination and insult? Those who reason by analogy are likely to say that the law must be enforced at any cost, if necessary by calling upon the Federal Government for armed troops. What would have happened if a Federal army had started toward Atlanta? The result would have been war and the destruction of many lives. Under the circumstances the use of physical force would have been neither effective nor ethical. The Supreme Court simply waited. The other twelve states sided with Georgia. The result was the eleventh amendment to the Constitution declaring that the Supreme Court does not have jurisdiction in the case of a suit of an individual against a State.

The record has been summarized by one authority as follows: "Until 1918 the Supreme Court,

which had by then sat in over forty cases where State sued State, not only never attempted to exert power over a State but, when called on to discuss that question, invariably declared it had no such power. In 1918, however, Chief Justice White, in the West Virginia case, declared that 'judicial power essentially involves the right to enforce.' But did he try to enforce? Did he send a sheriff to the State of West Virginia? He did not. He pleaded with West Virginia to acquiesce voluntarily in the court's decree and so save everybody from an embarrassing and disagreeable situation. If you doubt me, read his opinion. So we find that there has never been an instance in our history where an attempt has been made to enforce a Supreme Court decision against a State by the exertion of power. During these one hundred and forty years all manner of interstate controversies have come before the Supreme Court—boundary disputes, economic quarrels, all the typical and favorite war-breeding issues; they have been resolved by the court and peaceably acquiesced in by the States, except in a few rare cases in our earlier history where, the states declining to acquiesce, the decrees were not enforced. Fortunately so, for an attempt to enforce would surely have resulted in war."⁵⁷

There is therefore no hope at all in collective *armed* security. *The hope is to be found in an entirely different kind of collective security.* And this brings us back to the other sections of the United Nations Organization, the sections dealing with mutual aid and the pacific settlement of disputes: the Assembly, the Economic and Social

Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the International Court of Justice.

In a notable article in *Foreign Affairs*, October, 1945, John Foster Dulles, an adviser to Governor Dewey and to President Truman, wrote: "The role of the Security Council is predominantly negative. Its task is to stop the nations from public brawling, but it has no mandate to change the conditions which make brawls likely. By contrast, the General Assembly, directly or through its Economic and Social Council, is charged: to promote international cooperation in economic, social, cultural, educational and health fields; to assist in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion and, in this connection, to establish a Commission on Human Rights; to promote higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development; to coordinate the policies and activities of what the Charter calls 'specialized agencies,' such as the World Bank and the Food and Agricultural Organization; to promote the development and codification of international law; to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations; to deal with colonial trusteeships for nonstrategic areas; and, generally, to discuss any matter within the scope of the Charter—thus assuming the role of a 'town meeting of the world,' where public opinion is focused as an effective force."

Mutual aid in the solution of common problems and the removal of common dangers is the way to a just and enduring peace. Security will

INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENT

never be found in threats of armed action or in resort to armed hostilities. Faith in armed power produces attitudes and leads to forms of behavior which multiply perils and intensify dangers. If war between the United States and the Soviet Union is to be averted, these mighty nations must join together in common efforts to solve common problems. Because of the respective situations of these countries, this means that the United States must cooperate with Soviet Russia in rebuilding devastated cities and towns, in re-equipping industries which were destroyed, and in helping the people of that land to recover from the colossal losses of war. The total number killed in Russia has been estimated at 20 to 25 million soldiers and civilians. The total damage to property by invading hordes of Germans and then by the "scorched earth" policy of the Russians themselves as they were driven back is almost beyond computation. Many years of titanic effort will be required to bring about recovery and then advance to an adequate standard of living. The Soviet Union therefore needs loans and credits with which to buy in the United States enormous quantities of machinery, equipment and supplies. Equally important is a mutual effort on the part of these two nations to help solve common problems in Europe and in Asia. Relief, rehabilitation, recovery, and the re-establishment of orderly processes of life require the effective functioning of permanent agencies of international government.

The possibilities and potentialities of the General Assembly are vast and varied. If the nations are sufficiently aware of the desperateness of the world crisis and if they are sufficiently

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

determined to put forth common efforts to solve common problems, the Assembly can quickly become the decisive factor in international relations. If peoples everywhere could get the idea out of their minds that security is to be found in armed might and could realize vividly that *safety can be found only in mutual aid undergirded by mutual goodwill and mutual confidence*, in a single generation long strides could be taken toward adequate international government. It would be possible to strengthen the present fatal weaknesses of the General Assembly. "The political inadequacy of the United Nations Organization is obvious," writes Mr. Dulles. "Any political order which eliminates major violence over a long period of time must depend largely on laws defining, concretely and acceptably, what conduct is admissible and what is not . . . The Charter itself does not establish rules of conduct which the Organization is committed to enforce . . . The nations represented at San Francisco had not yet reached the position where they constituted a true community with common judgments about conduct. Also, many of them did not want the establishment of any law which would be superior to their own particular will and conscience . . . The San Francisco Conference also failed to establish a body to make laws hereafter. There is to be an international court; but courts do not, or at least should not, legislate. The Assembly is directed to encourage the development and codification of international law. But neither it nor the Security Council is given any authority to enact law . . . The fact is, the small powers as well as the big ones are still tenacious of special privileges."

INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Nations are at present unwilling to delegate a sufficient portion of their national sovereignty to the UNO to make possible the effective functioning of international government. Political leaders in many lands are now reflecting the attitudes shown by Patrick Henry as he fought strenuously to prevent the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. When Patrick Henry cried out, "Give me liberty or give me death!" he was thinking in terms of the state rather than of the nation. Upon being elected a delegate from Virginia to the Constitutional Convention, he felt obliged to decline because he "smelt a rat." After the Federal Constitution had been drafted and submitted to the states, he bitterly fought ratification. "We are come hither," he exclaimed, "to preserve the poor Commonwealth of Virginia, if it can be done; something must be done to preserve your liberty and mine. Our legislatures will indeed be a ludicrous spectacle—one hundred and eighty men marching in solemn, farcical procession, exhibiting a mournful proof of the lost liberty of their country, without the power of restoring it . . . This Constitution is said to have beautiful features; but when I come to examine these features, sir, they appear to me horribly frightful. Among other deformities, it has an awful squinting; it squints toward monarchy . . . Your president may easily become king . . . I would rather infinitely, and I am sure most of this Convention are of the same opinion, have a king, lords, and commons, than a government so replete with such insupportable evils . . . As this government stands, I despise and abhor it." This is Patrick Henry talking about the Constitution of the United States!

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

It is imperative that the ominous significance of sovereignty be clearly understood. Long ago clans of blood relatives were sovereign; each clan did as it pleased—until it clashed with another sovereign clan, and they fought it out until one group was vanquished. Then tribes, then cities, then baronies, then provinces, then petty kingdoms, then states in turn were sovereign, with the consequence of countless wars: inter-tribal, inter-city, inter-barony, inter-provincial, inter-kingdom, inter-state.

Sovereignty, the right to decide policy and to determine course of action, is lawlessness. Under law in a democracy, citizens are not individually sovereign, that is, every citizen is not permitted to act as he pleases but is obliged to obey the laws enacted by representative government. Under law in a democracy, cities are not sovereign but are bound together by inter-city and inter-state processes of law and order. Within our Federal Union the states are no longer sovereign because the creation of inter-state government was made possible by the voluntary relinquishment of sufficient sovereign powers to enable the new Union to enact inter-state law and establish due process of law between community and community.

International government is now required more urgently than was inter-state government one hundred and fifty years ago. To make this possible, nations must delegate a portion of their sovereignty to international agencies of government. The states delegated certain powers and retained all powers not thus delegated. This is the proper procedure for nations in our day. It would be folly to grant unlimited and undefined powers to international

agencies and tribunals. But it is also extremely perilous to go to the other extreme and permit a single nation by use of veto power to paralyze action by the UNO. Authority to reach decisions about matters which are essentially international in nature and which vitally effect the welfare of many peoples should be delegated to the United Nations Organization, and not retained for arbitrary use by sovereign nations.

There is no likelihood that in our time any great power will delegate authority to the Security Council to use sanctions or forcible measures in spite of its own negative vote. For this purpose the veto will be retained. But surely it is clear that *the peace of the world depends upon the willingness of nations to give up the right to veto PACIFIC measures of mutual aid agreed upon by a substantial majority of the nations represented in the UNO*. If Patrick Henry and men of like mind had succeeded in defeating ratification of the Constitution, the sovereign State of Virginia and every other State would have suffered irreparable loss. And in our time statesmen who talk loudest about maintaining unabridged national sovereignty are blocking the way to a just and enduring peace through international action undergirded by international goodwill.

The admission must be made frankly that serious dangers are inherent in the granting of substantial sovereign power to the UNO. Nationalism has long been so intense that peoples have become accustomed to thinking and acting in their own narrow interests. Suspicion and hostility are so deeply embedded that nations are reluctant to put themselves at the mercy of collective judgments

about vital issues. Law never provides absolute justice. Before an international tribunal a nation always confronts the possibility that the combined interests of many other nations may outweigh its own interests. Under a reign of international law and pacific adjustment of international questions, a nation may find it necessary to make substantial changes in its own policies and suffer serious losses.

The alternative procedure, however, is far more perilous. If a nation is unwilling to permit collective decisions about issues vitally affecting many peoples and insists upon exercising the arbitrary sovereign right to go its own way in defiance of the common good, the consequence is international anarchy, international hostility and international war. Therefore, no safe course of action is open to the nations. The choice is a choice between dangers. The perilous course of delegating adequate jurisdiction and authority to the UNO to make non-warlike decisions must be followed if a third world war is to be averted.

A hopeful sign of the times is found in a recent address by Anthony Eden, former Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, in which he said: "Every succeeding scientific discovery makes greater nonsense of old-time concepts of sovereignty . . . I have been unable to see—and I am still unable to see—any final solution that will make the world safe from atomic power other than we all abate our present ideas of sovereignty. We have got somehow to take the sting out of nationalism . . . In the light of discoveries about atomic energy I think that the San Francisco Charter should be reviewed particularly with respect to the veto

which is an anachronism in the modern world."⁶² A similar point of view was recently expressed by Herbert V. Evatt, Foreign Minister of Australia.

Foreign Secretary Bevin on November 23, 1945, commented favorably on the suggestion of Anthony Eden that national sovereignty be limited, saying: "The fact is no one ever surrenders sovereignty. They merge it into a greater sovereignty for a limited and specific purpose . . . I am willing to sit with anybody of any party of any nation to try and devise a franchise or constitution for a world assembly of limited objective, the objective of peace. When we get to that stage, we shall have taken a great progressive step."

The fact should be recognized, however, that it is easier for representatives of English-speaking countries to express these ideas because they do not expect to be outvoted in the Security Council. Leaders of Soviet Russia, on the other hand, are obsessed with the conviction that their regime is constantly threatened by a coalition of capitalist powers. Therefore, it is not surprising that Eden's pronouncement should bring forth adverse comment in Soviet Russia. *Pravda*, the official organ of the Communist Party, said that advocacy of world parliament or world government is really undermining the UNO Charter which rests upon the foundation of unanimity, or right of veto.⁶³

Citizens of English-speaking countries are therefore faced with a double problem: how to persuade their own governments to delegate sufficient jurisdiction and authority to the UNO, and how to persuade their governments to behave in ways that will help to persuade the Soviet Union likewise to delegate adequate authority to international agen-

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

cies. Success in this effort requires *a sharp distinction between delegating power to take warlike action and power to adopt non-warlike measures*. Soviet leaders simply will not give up the right to veto the use of armed sanctions and other forcible measures. With difficulty, they may be persuaded to relinquish the right to veto *pacific* measures of mutual aid.

To the extent that nations are really determined to engage in mutual aid, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization will prove to be a significant instrument. Its possibilities are vast beyond exaggeration; its achievements may be pitiful indeed. Everything depends upon the willingness of governments and peoples to think and to feel internationally. If national interest continues to be the dynamic of diplomatic action, only feeble use will be made of the Economic and Social Council. In many ways it is the most hopeful section of the UNO. It consists of eighteen members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly, and its decisions are reached by a majority vote of members present and voting. There is no requirement that the Big Five be represented on the Economic and Social Council, and no veto power is given to them. A cynic might make the comment that no such veto is needed because final action will be taken by the Security Council, and in that body any permanent member can veto any proposal, except that no member can veto the pacific settlement of a dispute to which it is a party. Thus it is apparent that the achievements of the Economic and Social Council may be pitiful indeed. But if the nations are really determined to prevent an atomic war

and to engage in common efforts to solve common problems, the recommendations of the majority of the members of the Economic and Social Council will be taken seriously and incorporated into international behavior. Its functions are broad and include initiating studies and making reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters; the making of recommendations concerning any such matters; the preparing of draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly; the making of recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

Collective security may progressively be undergirded by effective utilization of the functions of the Economic and Social Council. Soviet Russia and other great powers will not give up the right to veto the use of coercive measures, but they may be willing to accept majority recommendations of the Economic and Social Council and transform them into international law. If they are unwilling to engage in effective forms of mutual aid, there is high probability that the third world war will be fought.

Adequate agencies for enacting laws is an essential part of the process of maintaining the peace in any community. Rapid strides must be made in perfecting instruments for the creation of international law. As quickly as possible the UNO must be authorized and empowered to pass laws in the sphere of jurisdiction specially delegated to it by member states. The desirable procedure would be parallel to the law-making power of our inter-state Union. At the present time, however, the peoples

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

of the respective countries have been so thoroughly indoctrinated and propagandized that they are unwilling to grant law-making power to the United Nations Organization. Nevertheless, rapid progress in creating international law could be made if governments would quickly ratify agreements reached in the Economic and Social Council, the Assembly and the Security Council. The essential requirement is willingness to cooperate in solving common problems and to abide by common judgments. With this willingness and this readiness, international law would be created through the ratification of international agreements.

Another potentially significant instrument of pacific settlement is found in the International Court of Justice of the United Nations. All members of the UNO are automatically members of the Court. The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply: (a) international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states; (b) international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law; (c) the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations; (d) judicial decisions and teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

Member states may sign the optional clause, thereby accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, in all legal disputes concerning: (a) the interpretation of a treaty; (b) any question of international law; (c) the existence

of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The International Labor Organization was established simultaneously with the League of Nations and the World Court following the First World War for the purpose of dealing internationally with labor problems. It has functioned through an International Labor Office and Secretariat and through International Labor Conferences. For several reasons the machinery of the ILO was not incorporated into the structure of the United Nations Organization, chiefly because of opposition from Soviet Russia. At the twenty-seventh International Labor Conference in Paris at the end of 1945 there were 48 nations represented and there is every reason to believe that the important work of the ILO will be continued, either as an independent agency working in close collaboration with the UNO, or that it will be merged with the UNO.

Nations with a will to peace and with a realization of the price to be paid could quickly provide themselves with the structure of peace. The ominous possibility of another great war does not arise from the weakness of the United Nations Organization because that weakness could be transformed into strength within a single decade if governments and peoples were so determined. The fascinating power of nationalism and the credulous trust in armed might combine to produce attitudes and behavior which disrupt and destroy friendly relations across national boundaries. With all of its serious weaknesses and ominous threats, *the*

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

United Nations Organization could quickly be transformed into a mighty instrument of peace if the nations had the will and the faith required.

If the peoples and leaders of nations are unwilling to create sufficient international government without delay, the anarchy of armed coalitions will hurl modern civilization over the precipice of atomic war. The various countries are now so interdependent, the weapons of war have become so suicidal, and the fabric of world society is so fragile and vulnerable, that the alternatives before this generation are stark and inescapable: *create and utilize international government or destroy civilization in the holocaust of atomic war.* The hope is not in collective military coercion. That road leads straight to the abyss. The hope is in mutual aid in the solution of common problems and in the removal of common dangers through the utilization of the facilities of the Economic and Social Council, the Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the International Labor Organization, and other agencies of international government.

(3) Economic Justice and Fellowship.

Continuous prosperity in the United States for the next twenty years would enable this nation to make a maximum contribution to the winning of the peace, whereas prolonged depression would aggravate and intensify all the factors making for war. It is imperative therefore that the peace movement take seriously the effort to provide full employment.

A high standard of living for all the people of this land is within reach, and it is possible for

America to play a leading role in raising the standard of living all over the earth. Production is possible. The problem is to provide means of continuous consumption. In almost every area producers are able to supply a vast volume of commodities if assured a profitable market. It is difficult to conceive a limit to the number of shoes, to use a single illustration, that could be manufactured if they could all be bought by the wearers of shoes. Science and technology, fertility of soil and adequacy of raw materials, abundance of workers, administrative genius in production and distribution, and numerous other factors combine to raise the level of productivity beyond the wildest dreams of previous generations. Plenty for everybody is just around the corner.

Catastrophic economic depression is just over the brink of the precipice. Such is the contradiction of modern economic society. Consumers may be unable to buy, with the result that producers cannot sell, employers cannot provide work, families cannot obtain adequate income, consumers must get along with still less, producers are less able to sell, employers offer fewer jobs, consumers receive less income, and round and round the vicious circle of privation and misery and despair.

Efficient distribution of the national income: here is the heart of the economic problem for this generation. If too much money is available for the construction of shoe factories and not enough money is available for the purchase of shoes, the sellers cannot sell, etc., etc. That is to say, there must be an efficient distribution of national funds between savings for investment in productive equipment, on the one hand and the amount avail-

able for spending by consumers, on the other. If an excessive share of national income goes to a small proportion of the population, the receivers of this income will be unable to spend the required proportion for consumers' goods. Moreover, they will be unable to invest these excessive funds in productive enterprises because of inadequate markets. Thus, in relation to national purchasing power for consumption, there will be over-production, idle money, idle plants, idle men, depression and misery.

Interest and dividends provide a high proportion of the funds invested in productive enterprises. Wages and salaries, to a substantial extent, are spent on consumers' goods. Even when a small proportion of workers' wages is saved, the amount usually is later spent for consumption. Thus the comparative levels of interest-dividend and wage-salary determine the flow of national income respectively into channels of production and consumption. If rates of interest-dividend go up comparatively and rates of wage-salary come down, additional proportions of the national income are available for productive equipment and smaller proportions are used for consumption.

In a 1938 message recommending the creation of a joint Congressional committee to assemble the facts concerning concentration of economic power, the President said: "The year 1929 was a banner year for distribution of stock ownership. But in that year three-tenths of 1 per cent of our population received 78 per cent of the dividends reported by individuals. This was roughly the same effect as if, out of every 300 persons in our population, one person received 78 cents out of every dollar

of corporate dividends, while the other 299 persons divided up the other 22 cents between them."

Therefore, when dividends are comparatively high, the proportion of the total national income going to the one-person-out-of-three-hundred is excessively high. Since the President's estimate was made, concentration of economic power in the United States has become yet more extreme. War-time profits have swollen huge fortunes beyond anything previously known in this country. The United States Securities and Exchange Commission has published figures as of June 30, 1945:

1. The total current assets of United States corporations were 99 billion dollars, as compared with 54 billions in 1939.

2. Current liabilities were 51 billions, as compared with 30 billions in 1939.

3. The net working capital of American corporations doubled, from 24 billions in 1939 to 48 billions in 1945.

4. Cash on hand and in banks jumped from 11 billions to 24 billions, and holdings of Government securities climbed from two billions to 22 billions in 1945.

If the unprecedented strength of American industry is used in providing employment at adequate wages and salaries, prosperity can be maintained. If, on the other hand, high dividend payments are continued while total wage payments are reduced, serious economic depression will be the consequence. The income flowing to the mass of people, the total purchasing power of the nation, determines industry's ability to sell and to provide employment. This total has been reduced in two substantial ways: millions of wartime workers,

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

especially women and aged people, are no longer gainfully employed; and the length of the working day has been shortened. Unless wage rates for returning veterans and other workers are substantially increased and maintained at a high level, the total purchasing power of the consumers will drop disastrously.

In this period of bitter industrial conflict, one question should constantly be in the minds and on the lips of the American people: how will the outcome of the wave of strikes and lockouts affect the distribution of industry's revenues? If the companies win, will the purchasing power of the workers be sufficient to provide the general market needed to maintain general production at a high level? If the workers win, will the income flowing to investors be sufficient to provide adequately for plant structure and equipment?

Consider the significance of the effort to establish a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour for industrial workers. At this rate for 40 hours, a worker receives \$30 per week. If he works 45 hours, he receives an extra \$3.75. A budget of \$33.75 for an average family of four members will provide:

\$14.50	food
4.00	housing
4.00	clothing
3.50	household expenses
3.50	tax and social security
4.25	transportation, health, education, etc.

\$33.75

Throughout industry a high proportion of workers receive minimum rates of payment. It is obvious therefore that the section of the population living on minimum earnings of 75 cents per hour do not

have the purchasing power needed to buy their share of industry's output. This truth emphasizes the seriousness of the possibility that another catastrophic depression will come because of inadequate markets to absorb the goods of full productivity. A high level of purchasing power is absolutely essential to prosperity through efficient utilization of national resources and national energies.

Secretary Wallace, in his best-seller, *Sixty Million Jobs*, maintains that America has now become a nation of 60 million jobs and 200 billion dollar income. His contention is that we dare not permit unemployment for millions of workers. If private industry cannot provide enough jobs, then government must provide sufficient jobs to make up the difference. To do this efficiently there must be foresight and planning in advance. Therefore, Congress should establish adequate national machinery through which (1) full information concerning productivity and employment shall constantly be available, (2) trends may be foreseen, (3) public enterprises may be expanded at the proper time and on an adequate scale to provide sufficient jobs for the potentially unemployed. This proposal places maximum responsibility on industry to supply jobs at adequate pay, with the understanding that to the degree industry fails the government will provide employment in constructive enterprises.

Housing affords the maximum opportunity for providing new jobs. So urgent is the nation's need of new homes that four million jobs can be provided for ten years. Health facilities also require substantial expansion. Surgeon General Parran

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

estimates the cost of needed hospital construction at two billion dollars. Secretary Wallace estimates that a million men could profitably be employed for ten years in River Valley Development, along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The wages paid these men would not only increase substantially the purchasing power of the consumers, but would place at the disposal of the nation invaluable permanent facilities for raising the standard of living of the entire population. Another million men could well be employed for four or five years in land conservation, with another million engaged for the same period in forest development. Rural electrification requires the work of a million men for three years.

Full employment can be provided and therefore prosperity can be maintained if the people are so determined. This was proved in wartime. Financially and economically it is possible to provide full employment in peacetime also through the combined actions of industry and government. Reluctance to use the facilities of government and failure to look far enough ahead and be able to act in time may cause this country to drift into a serious depression. The record of the past century shows clearly the inability of private industry to prevent depressions. Adequate action by government, action taken in ample time, is an imperative requirement of prosperity.

Planning for prosperity is a necessity. Drifting plunges the nation into depression. Representatives of the people—representatives of investors and of citizens, representatives of management and of workers—must decide upon the measures required for the continuance of prosperity and they

must make adequate advance preparation to inaugurate the various elements in the program at the proper times. This is planning, the planning upon which the future of democracy depends.

Planning is not the road to serfdom, as has been so fallaciously argued by Hayek and other writers. Fascism did not come in Italy as a result of the extension of governmental power. Nazism did not come in Germany because of social and economic planning, nor because of strong government which steadily became stronger until it developed into totalitarianism. On the contrary, fascism came in Italy because of the breakdown of government and of social processes. Mussolini marched upon Rome clad in pajamas sleeping in a Pullman berth because of the impotence of industry and government to solve desperate problems. Nothing could be more remote from the truth than the assertion that the German people planned themselves into fascism. Totalitarianism was a nation's desperate effort to find release from unemployment, privation, despair, and the domination of their country by powerfully armed enemies. The Russian people did not plan themselves into the totalitarian dictatorship now wielded by the Communist Party of that land. The old regime was unable to solve the primary economic and political problems and collapsed almost totally. Dictatorship is not derived from strong government. Dictatorship is a consequence of the inability of peoples to solve their problems in other ways.

If American democracy should ever be abandoned and replaced by totalitarian dictatorship, this will not happen as the consequence of steady extension of governmental function and authority.

If this country is engulfed by a tidal wave of totalitarianism, this will be the fate of a people who failed to use the facilities of government sufficiently to prevent paralyzing unemployment and catastrophic depression. Economic misery is the most ominous threat to political democracy. Maldistribution of national income is a primary cause of economic depression and economic suffering. The action of government is required to insure efficient distribution of national income. Economic planning is essential to the preservation of democracy.

The concentration of economic power in the United States is now so advanced that mild measures will not be sufficient to bring about that distribution of national income which is required to enable the consumers to buy what they need. Just before the outbreak of World War II, a Congressional committee known as the Temporary National Economic Committee published volume after volume of evidence showing the titanic power wielded by powerful financiers and industrialists.⁶⁷ In his message to Congress requesting the creation of this joint committee, the President said: "Ownership of corporate assets: Of all corporations reporting from every part of the Nation, one-tenth of 1 per cent of them owned 52 per cent of the assets of all of them. And to clinch the point: Of all corporations reporting, less than 5 per cent of them owned 87 per cent of all the assets of all of them. Income and profits of corporations: Of all the corporations reporting from every part of the country, one-tenth of 1 per cent of them earned 50 per cent of the net income of all of them. And to clinch the point: Of all the manufacturing corpo-

rations reporting, less than 4 per cent of them earned 84 per cent of all the net profits of all of them."

After listening to many witnesses over a two-year period, the members of the committee unanimously said: "If the political structure is designed to preserve the freedom of the individual, the economic structure must not be permitted to destroy it . . . No person who with an open mind reviewing the materials gathered by this committee can fail to conclude that the rise of political centralism is largely the product of economic centralism . . . Concentration of government has appeared because local communities and states are no longer economically self-sufficient but are dependent for their commercial and industrial life upon the acts and decisions of persons and organizations beyond their jurisdictions . . . If democracy is really to survive, then all the organizations through which man operates—industrial, social, and political—must also be democratic. Political freedom cannot survive if economic freedom is lost . . . So great a proportion of all national savings and all national wealth have fallen under the control of a few organized enterprises that the opportunity of those individuals who will constitute the next generation will be completely foreclosed unless, by common consent of leadership in business and government, we undertake to reverse the trends responsible for the present crisis. We know that most of the wealth and income of the country is owned by a few large corporations, that these corporations in turn are owned by an infinitesimally small number of people and that the profits from the operation of these corporations go to a very small group."

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

Wartime profits have strengthened enormously the power of the richest industrialists and the situation is now more ominous than when the committee wrote these words of warning. The fact is that the ten thousand richest men in this country exercise decisive control over industries producing a huge proportion of the nation's total wealth. They also dominate the press, the radio, the movies, and they exercise mighty influence in politics, education and organized religion. This excessive concentration of power is the gravest of the threats confronting our democracy. It is imperative that this power-to-control-the-nation be broken up if the national income is to be distributed in ways that provide the consumers with adequate purchasing power. The breaking of this strangle-hold is at the same time necessary and difficult, extremely difficult to accomplish. An adequate program of action must include:

1. Transferring the ownership of natural resources, public utilities, banks, the chief means of transportation and communication, the steel and automotive industries, from investors to citizens is essential. These properties are no longer owned by single individuals, single families and partnerships. The Ford financial empire is such a conspicuous exception as to emphasize the prevailing practice. Vast corporate enterprises are now owned collectively by groups of investors. When a corporation is owned by 100,000 investors, or half a million investors, it is not accurate to speak of that vast enterprise as being privately owned. The fact of collective ownership is obvious. Collective ownership by citizens, in contrast to collective ownership by investors, increases enormously the

power of consumers over the distribution of the national income. Under both types of collective ownership, the actual operation is in the hands of employed managers, technicians and workers. Experience in administering the vast Tennessee Valley Authority makes it clear that citizens can combine popular determination of policy with expert administration of that policy. The peoples' representatives in Congress decide the policy of the TVA, but Congressmen do not administer policy. Complete responsibility for carrying out the policy is entrusted to three expert directors.

2. The rapid expansion of the Consumers' Co-operative Movement will improve the position of consumers in relation to investors. No profit goes to investors from cooperative enterprises, merely interest on actual capital loaned to the cooperative. The margin between selling price and cost is returned to purchasers in proportion to volume of buying, or the margin is used for community projects designated by cooperative members. To the degree that the cooperative movement grows, the chasm between super-privilege and under-privilege will be bridged.

3. Inheritance taxes must be used drastically. If all loopholes were closed and thereby all of an individual's wealth became subject to inheritance taxes, great fortunes could be broken up within the near future. The maximum to be inherited by an individual could be set at a million dollars or a hundred thousand dollars or any desired level.

4. Income taxes must be used drastically. If all loopholes were closed and all net income made subject to income taxes, the maximum annual income of an individual could be set at a million

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

dollars or a hundred thousand dollars or twenty-five thousand dollars or any desired level. Efficient distribution of the national income requires both minimum incomes and maximum incomes.

5. Social insurance is an effective instrument in advancing the equitable distribution of the national income. Adequate wages and salaries cannot solve the economic problems of victimized families without breadwinners. Therefore, supplementary income is necessary in order to continue the purchasing power of families victimized by sickness, accidents, unemployment and old age.

6. The accomplishment of this program requires a powerfully organized and unified labor movement, and the organization of citizens in a political party committed to the realization of these ends. The Republican Party and the Democratic Party are both committed to the present system of ownership of vast corporations by groups of investors as investors, rather than by citizens and consumers as such. The Communist Party is founded upon the basic premise of the dictatorship of the proletariat through the violent seizure of power and the confiscation of private property, and is highly objectionable. The Socialist Party should become the nucleus of a new political party supported by organized labor, organized farmers, organized consumers, as has long been maintained by Norman Thomas and other Socialists.

The productivity of the modern machine is so illimitable that prosperity can be maintained and economic depression prevented, if the people will take the steps necessary to bring about such a distribution of national income as will enable the consumers to consume on an adequate scale. The

will to maintain prosperity is required, the will to prevent economic depression. New possibilities of vast significance have been opened by the release of atomic energy. Once this illimitable source of energy is harnessed to the production of necessities and comforts, the last excuse for enforced poverty will have disappeared.

The maintenance of a high level of prosperity in the United States will enable the people of this country to make a maximum contribution to the raising of living standards in other countries and to the stabilizing of economic conditions throughout the earth. On the other hand, if the people of America stagger into another serious depression, the effects on other lands will be disastrous and every war-making tendency will be accelerated.

4. Racial Justice and Fellowship.

Friendly relations among the nations are jeopardized by race prejudice, race discrimination and race exploitation. The entire earth is filled with the victims of the Nazi doctrine of race. Millions of human beings in our generation have been persecuted unto cruel death as a result of the idea: "because my race is superior I will treat you as an inferior." In its early stages race discrimination does not appear to be devastating, just as a victim of leprosy may long be unaware that he has contracted the dread scourge. But race prejudice grows into race exploitation and race hostility, with resultant riots, lynchings, pogroms.

The refusal of the Allied statesmen at Versailles to grant Japan's request that the principle of race equality be recognized officially seriously offended and alienated the leaders of that nation. Likewise,

the refusal of Congress to place Japanese immigrants on a quota basis along with other peoples and the unwillingness of America to receive any immigrants from Japan produced a storm of resentment and hostility throughout that country.

In India the fires of bitterness and enmity have long been fanned by British snobbishness, discrimination and exploitation. Most members of the British diplomatic corps and business community consider themselves superior to the Indian people and in numerous ways treat them as inferiors. The idea of white superiority dominates the actions of English-speaking business men and governmental agents in all sections of Asia and Africa and poisons relationships with yellow and brown and black peoples.

The emergence of Soviet Russia as one of the two most powerful nations magnifies the importance of race relations. Soviet leaders pride themselves upon their freedom from race prejudice and glory in the policy of race equality. To an extraordinary degree race discrimination and exploitation have been abolished. The early Bolsheviks belonged to a persecuted minority and sought supporters from victimized minorities. Their entire background and philosophy caused them to oppose strenuously the cult of superiority. The population of Russia is composed of a vast conglomeration of races and nationalities, with a minimum of race sentiment. The practice of race equality within the Soviet Union is a powerful asset to Soviet leaders in their dealings with the peoples of Asia and Africa who have long felt the arrogance and discrimination of the British and Americans.

If the statesmen of the great powers are so stu-

pid as to engage in a struggle of atomic armaments, race relations will be an important factor in determining the new balance of power. The colored peoples of the earth vastly outnumber the white people. Everywhere there is unmistakable evidence of determination to throw off white domination. If English-speaking statesmen and business men continue their arrogance and discrimination and exploitation, they will thereby guarantee that the vast populations of Asia and Africa will add their weight to Russia's side of the balance of power.

Race discrimination is indeed venomous poison. To check its flow through the veins of modern civilization is both necessary and difficult. The individual must begin with himself, with his ideas and his emotions. A concerned individual should familiarize himself with the findings of scientific inquiry. "Though races exhibit obvious and measurable physical differences, there are no inherited intellectual or moral superiorities. Leading anthropologists are overwhelmingly in agreement on this point. A century ago it was the fashion of head-measurers and anthropologists in Europe to cling to the theory of the master race, with a list of descending races who were graded, in most cases, by the colors of their skin. And almost without exception the particular anthropologist found that the master race happened to be his own. Count Arthur de Gobineau formulated and was the first great propagandist of the master-race theory—in a book called "Les Races Humaines." It was copied by many others, among them Houston Chamberlain, a Germanophile who some fifty years ago was known as the Kaiser's private an-

thropologist. Gobineau's theory was the inspiration of Hitler's master-racism; and thus a piece of evil ignorance which is ridiculed by modern scientists—and rejected by most churches as heresy—inflamed the mind of a mean and thwarted psychopath and enabled him to drive a world to war largely through the manipulation of the latent prejudices and hatreds that exists in the masses of unthinking people. This is a list of a few of the anthropologists, unquestioned leaders in this field, whose books and monographs through the years have taken the race myth apart piece by piece and laid it forever, like witchcraft, in the graveyard of primitive superstitions: Franz Boas, Ales Hrdlicka, Melville Herskovitz, Ruth Benedict, Earnest Hooton, Carlton Coon, Otto Klineberg, M. F. Ashley-Montagu. There are many others."⁷¹

To control emotion is more difficult than to clarify mind. Highly desirable, therefore, is the practice of multiplying favorable contacts with members of other races and cultural groups, in school, college, church, home. Millions of white people have never formed a friendship with a Negro, and millions of Caucasians have never experienced comradeship with an American of Oriental heritage. Especially significant is the opening of homes to guests of varied backgrounds. Members of churches attended primarily by Caucasians should endeavor to multiply friendly contacts with members of churches attended chiefly by Negroes or by Chinese or Japanese or Mexicans. Church membership should be wide open to members of all races and groups and a continuing effort should be put forth to win members from these various races and nationalities. It is a shocking

RACIAL JUSTICE AND FELLOWSHIP

scandal that Christian churches should practice segregation. The Christian gospel of universal brotherhood will be denatured and devitalized until this cancerous practice is removed from the churches.

Insight may be deepened and appreciation may be kindled by sympathetic reading of books and periodicals written by members of other races and cultural groups. Fortunately, abundant literature is available and any librarian will gladly make suggestions. Likewise desirable is the practice of attending concerts and recitals of artists of varied backgrounds, and of listening to records of musicians from many lands.

Utmost emphasis should be given to the effort to provide equality of status and privilege for members of all races and cultural groups in the areas of employment, housing, and public facilities. Negroes have long been exploited by being the last to be hired, the first to be fired, and by being paid the lowest rates of wages. They have been excluded from many occupations and vocations. The shortage of manpower in wartime opened numerous doors for members of minority groups, but there is a serious possibility that many of these doors will progressively be closed as the competitive struggle becomes more intense. Wartime legislation made it illegal for employers to discriminate in employment against members of racial minorities. The Fair Employment Practices Committee was created to help enforce the provisions of this legislation. Such legislation and such enforcement agencies, national and state, are urgently required as permanent measures.

Segregation in housing prevails widely through-

out the United States and is a terrible handicap to minority groups. It is imperative that this form of segregation be abandoned as rapidly as public opinion can be changed and legal supports can be removed. Especially important is the effort to stop the spread of restrictive covenants by which Caucasians bind themselves not to sell or to rent property to members of "undesirable" races. Governmental action through public housing authorities is required for the provision of adequate housing facilities for victimized groups.

It is desirable that the practice be extended of adopting State laws on rights of citizens. A section of the California law protects rights of citizens in places of public accommodation or amusements as follows:

All citizens within the jurisdiction of this State are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities and privileges of inns, restaurants, hotels, eating houses, places where ice cream or soft drinks of any kind are sold for consumption on the premises, barber shops, bath houses, theatres, skating rinks, public conveyances and all other places of public accommodation or amusement, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, and applicable alike to all citizens.

Such a law will be enforced only to the degree that public opinion desires its enforcement. Therefore, it is essential that there be a rapid multiplication of concerned individuals who will endeavor to safeguard the rights and privileges of minority groups.

Education, persuasion and legislation may

RACIAL JUSTICE AND FELLOWSHIP

properly be supplemented *in some situations* by use of non-violent non-cooperation. Various groups have experimented with this means of removing discrimination against minority groups in restaurants, hotels and stores. The first step is for a responsible committee to talk with the owner and find out his reasons for excluding Negroes and Orientals, and to state their own reasons for opposing discrimination. This friendly approach has sometimes been successful and the discrimination abandoned. In some cases the owner has pointed out that he could not afford the loss that would be sustained if his customers were driven away by the presence of "undesirables." In some instances the visiting committee has agreed to help the owner find new customers if he loses old ones. Where persuasion failed and offers of mutual aid were rejected, non-violent non-cooperation has been resorted to in a friendly spirit. A delegation of interested white people and Negroes would enter a restaurant, take seats and wait to be served. When the Negroes were refused service, the entire group remained quietly in their seats throughout the entire meal hour. In other cases peaceful picketing was maintained, with placards appealing to citizens to withhold patronage until discrimination was abandoned. If maximum effectiveness is to be obtained certain principles must be adhered to resolutely: truth, frankness, goodwill, geniality, determination, perseverance, and no hostility or ill-will or violence whatever the provocation. Never should non-violent pressure be exerted until persistent use has been made of cordial appeal and moral suasion. Under some explosive conditions

non-violent pressure at a given moment may do more harm than good.

The urgency of the need for racial justice and fellowship deserves maximum emphasis. The next decade will be one of the most critical periods in human history, for evil and for good. Constructive action must be taken quickly.

5. *Empires Into Commonwealths.*

The struggle to acquire empires and to maintain them has long been a primary cause of war. Under the system of balance-of-armed-power, one nation's extension of its territorial and economic domain has the effect of upsetting the equilibrium and therefore leads to counter-extensions of political and economic control by a competing nation. Moreover, the seizure of territory confronts an imperialist power with new dangers which can only be safeguarded by the taking of additional territory. The significance of this fact is revealed by an examination of the meaning of the oft-repeated remark that the British Empire was built in a fit of absent-mindedness. British business men traveled far from their native isles and acquired commercial and financial advantages which could be maintained only by political control of new territory. This frequently required the use of armed force and military considerations demanded more secure positions by constant extensions of control. A vested right thus established often demanded for its protection the seizure of additional territory and further extensions of control. This process has for centuries kept the British Empire in continuous controversy and conflict with subject peoples and with rival imperialists. Here is the record:

EMPIRES INTO COMMONWEALTHS

Future relations between Soviet Russia and the English-speaking peoples will be determined primarily by their respective policies in relation to

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPATION IN WARS OF MODERN CIVILIZATION BY IMPORTANT STATES, BY FIFTY-YEAR PERIODS, 1480-1941 ⁷⁸															Total
State	1480- 1550	1550- 1600	1600- 1650	1650- 1700	1700- 1750	1750- 1800	1800- 1850	1850- 1900	1900- 1941						
England (Great Britain)	6	6	7	10	8	7	14	13	7						78
France	10	10	6	8	4	4	11	12	6						71
Netherlands	1	1	2	8	5	2	2	0	2						23
Spain	12	7	11	6	7	5	6	7	3						64
Empire (Austria)	13	4	3	8	7	5	6	3	3						52
Prussia (Germany)	0	1	1	3	4	4	2	3	5						23
Savoy (Italy)	0	0	4	1	5	2	1	5	7						25
Denmark	2	1	8	5	1	3	3	1	1						20
Sweden	2	6	4	4	5	3	2	0	0						26
Poland	3	4	7	5	3	2	1	1	4						30
Russia (U.S.S.R.)	2	6	7	8	7	10	10	4	7						61
Turkey	6	5	5	4	3	5	5	5	5						43
United States	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	5						13
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7						9
China	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	6						11
World	32	31	34	30	18	20	41	48	24						278

empires. If Great Britain remains determined to preserve her vast imperial domain, controversy

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

with the Soviet Union is certain to become more bitter and provocative. The nature of this danger will become clearer from a study of this chart showing the extent of British possessions:⁷⁴

(Colonial domain, excluding white self-ruling Dominions, but including colonies of those Dominions and including mandates and condominiums)

	Colonial Population	Area in Square Miles
Asia		
Ceylon	5,300,000	25,000
Hong Kong	1,071,000	32,000
India	389,000,000	1,580,000
Burma	14,600,000	192,000
Malaya	1,485,000	1,300
Federated Malay States	2,200,000	7,900
Unfederated Malay States	737,000	7,000
New Guinea	50,000	93,000
Borneo	270,000	29,000
	<hr/> 414,713,000	<hr/> 1,967,000
Africa		
Kenya	3,690,000	224,000
Uganda	3,890,000	94,000
Zanzibar	250,000	1,000
Mauritius	408,000	720
Nyasaland	1,680,000	37,000
Somaliland	500,000	68,000
Basutoland	562,000	12,000
Bechnansland	260,000	275,000
Swaziland	156,000	6,705
Southern Rhodesia	1,448,000	150,000
Northern Rhodesia	1,380,000	290,000
Nigeria	21,000,000	372,000
Gambia	14,000	69
Gold Coast	3,960,000	92,000
Sierra Leone Colony	121,000	2,500
Sierra Leone Protectorate	1,670,000	27,000
Sudan	6,590,000	967,000
Tanganyika	5,000,000	360,000
Southwest Africa	343,000	317,000
Union of South Africa (native, Colored, Asiatic)	7,586,000	300,000?
	<hr/> 60,508,000	<hr/> 3,595,994
West Indies and South America		
Bermuda	33,000	19
Guiana	361,000	89,000
Honduras	62,000	8,800
Bahamas	19,000	4,000

EMPIRES INTO COMMONWEALTHS

Barbados	156,000	166
Jamaica	1,237,000	4,000
Leeward Islands	98,000	422
Trinidad	522,000	2,000
Granada	90,000	133
St. Vincent	48,000	150
St. Lucia	73,000	233
	<hr/> 2,699,000	<hr/> 108,923
	Colonial	Area in
Pacific Ocean		
Pacific Islands	108,000	12,000
Papua	337,000	2,750
	<hr/> 445,000	<hr/> 14,750
Near East		
Cyprus	389,000	3,500
Palestine Mandate	1,600,000	27,000
	<hr/> 1,989,000	<hr/> 30,500
Total	480,354,000	5,717,367

When nations have established territorial and economic control of alien peoples, they feel as obliged to defend these vested interests as to safeguard their own homeland. This policy requires heavy armaments and ability to defend strategic waterways and land routes. The safeguarding of Britain's lifeline to India has long been a vital aspect of British policy, hence the necessity of maintaining a dominant position in the Mediterranean and the Near East. This struggle for imperial power produces concern for supplies of oil and other valuable resources. All this activity on the part of one empire-building nation stimulates and provokes similar action by other great powers, leading to bitter struggles for colonies, spheres of influence, protectorates, naval bases, coaling stations, airfields and other elements in the race of armed power. This conflict intensifies nationalism, magnifies the importance of national interest, strengthens determination to maintain national

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

sovereignty, increases trust in national armaments, and prolongs anarchy among nations.

The United States has been engaged in this struggle of imperialism to a lesser degree than Great Britain and France, although nineteen million people live in our dependencies: Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Samoa, and the Philippines. At the end of World War II the State Department published a proposed policy of retaining new strategic territories as naval bases and air bases. On September 5, 1945, the United States Navy recommended the retention of the following bases: Kodiak, east of Alaska Peninsula; Adak, in the Aleutians; Hawaii; Balboa, Canal Zone; Guam, Saipan and Tinian; Iwo Island in the Bonin and Volcano groups; Okinawa, in the Ryukus; Manus, in the Admiralties; the Philippines; Argentia in Newfoundland; Bermuda; Roosevelt Roads, in Puerto Rico; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; Coco Solo, Canal Zone.⁷⁵

American citizens should look carefully at a map showing the location of these bases. From Washington, D. C., to these eight sites in the Pacific the distance is from 4,000 to 10,000 miles, while the distance from the states of California and Washington varies from 1,000 to 7,000 miles. The Navy insists that control of these strategic bases is essential in self-defense. If this is valid reasoning, Great Britain and Soviet Russia are likewise justified in seeking to defend themselves by maintaining strategic bases at distances of 1,000 to 7,000 miles from their own frontiers.

It is clear to all Americans that Soviet strategic bases 1,000 miles or 7,000 miles distant from Russian soil will not increase the security of the

EMPIRES INTO COMMONWEALTHS

people of the United States, and it is equally clear to many other nations that strategic naval and air bases of the United States in far flung areas will not increase their security. In fact, it is obvious that the perpetuation of this system of national armed bases all over the earth is a primary cause of insecurity. So long as this system prevails it will be impossible to create adequate agencies of international government with appropriate jurisdiction and authority. Widely scattered naval and air bases are constituent elements in the balance-of-armed-power which, if perpetuated, will hurl the peoples of the earth into a suicidal third world war.

Therefore it is imperative that empires be transformed into commonwealths and free federations. The difference between empire and commonwealth is clearly revealed in the contrast in status of India and Canada. The former is not self-governing but is ruled from an imperial capital 5,000 miles away; the latter is free and independent. In three ways empires may be transformed into commonwealths: by grant of outright independence as a separate nation; by dominion status and complete freedom within the commonwealth; by temporary use of an international mandate. Peace or war will be determined by the speed and thoroughness with which this transformation is wrought.

Therefore it is important that we examine carefully the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations Organization dealing with the Trusteeship Council. As this section was adopted at San Francisco it is entirely inadequate and may prove to be useless. Indeed, it may prove to be a fraud and deception because of the false impression con-

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

veyed. On the other hand, if the imperialist powers change their basic attitude and commit themselves to the transformation of empires into commonwealths, Chapter XIII of the Charter will prove to be invaluable.

The very language of Article 86-1-A is significant: "Those members administering trust territories." Trust territories—are these words deception and mockery which merely cover up imperialist exploitation, or do they offer real hope of transition in status from dependency to freedom? The functions of the Trusteeship Council may be administered in a way that helps to perpetuate imperialist domination, or they may be carried out in a manner that accelerates the pace toward autonomy. The Trusteeship Council may consider reports from the administering authority; accept petitions and examine them; provide for periodic visits to trust territories; formulate questionnaires and assemble information.

If the great powers remain determined to continue their domination of subject peoples, this entire section of the Charter is not worth the ink required to print it. In that event, all questions dealing with dependencies will be considered a domestic matter not within the jurisdiction of the United Nations Organization. If there is resolute determination to transform empires into commonwealths, the Trusteeship Council can render invaluable assistance in administering international mandates for a limited period of transition from dependency to free people. The road chosen by the imperialist powers will decide whether it is to be peace or war in our time.

DISARMAMENT

6. *Disarmament.*

The race of armaments among the great powers has long been one of the most disturbing and provocative factors in international relations. One of its most dangerous features has been the blindness produced in national leaders. The military mind sees security for its own people in preponderance of armed might, and is blind to the fear and enmity engendered across frontiers. For generations Englishmen regarded as axiomatic the idea that Britain required a two-power fleet, that is, a fleet as powerful as the combined strength of any two fleets. These same Englishmen were blind to the fact this command of the seas provided them with unequalled opportunities for exploitation in all parts of the earth. In the years after Versailles the French military mind fervently believed that their overwhelming superiority over Germany in armaments would, if maintained, guarantee safety for France, and was utterly blind to the fact that this very dominance of France was the most powerful weapon in the hands of Hitler as he struggled for dictatorial power.

The blindness of the military mind is especially perilous because it is reflected in the smug assumption of national leaders that our own nation can be trusted with preponderance of armed power since we are a peace-loving people and offer no threat to any other country. Never has this danger been greater than in the present period because the English-speaking peoples and the Russians are alike complacent, self-righteous and arrogant to a high degree. The ends we are seeking are so obviously praiseworthy that we obliterate Dresden and Hiroshima with scarcely a twinge of con-

science. The ends the Soviet leaders are seeking are so noble that they liquidate millions of recalcitrant opponents and impose penal servitude at hard labor in the frozen north upon additional millions of party enemies or class enemies. If the English-speaking peoples and the Soviet Union should stagger into another great war, it would be fought with as much complacency and self-righteousness as any war in history. The foundation of the military mind is the doctrine of military necessity: that is right which is necessary to victory, that is wrong which stands in the way of triumph in arms. This idea is also the foundation of the Communist mind.

The release of atomic energy magnifies enormously the danger of continuing the race of armaments with Soviet Russia. If another war comes it will be fought with pilotless rockets loaded with atomic bombs. It is highly probable that soon these missiles of devastation can be launched from the decks of giant submarines 200 miles or 500 miles off shore. The first primitive atomic bomb killed more than 50,000 persons in Hiroshima. Improved bombs ten-fold or even an hundred-fold more explosive will soon be ready for use, if they are not already stored away for use without delay and without warning. It is sheer madness to depend upon armaments for safety now that atomic energy has been harnessed and distance has been annihilated.

It is imperative therefore that the United States seek an agreement with the Soviet Union (1) to abolish military conscription, and (2) to reduce armaments simultaneously at the same ratio. It will not be easy to reach such an agreement be-

cause fear is so dominant, entrenched interests are so powerful, and inertia is so paralyzing. For this reason there is a terrible possibility that the nations will stagger into another great war. In the meantime, every possible effort should be put forth to awaken the American people to a keen realization of the menace of the military mind and to a clear understanding of the danger of continuing the race of armaments. The least that we can do is to abandon military conscription of our own youth and to persevere in the effort to obtain an agreement with Soviet Russia.

Reductions of armaments by example is a dangerous procedure, but it is far less perilous than the continuance of the race of armaments. It may be necessary for the United States to take the initiative and set an example in order to reduce Russian fears and to win the Soviet Union to the policy of mutual aid in the solution of common problems under the reign of international law functioning through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual confidence. So long as the race of armaments continues it will be impossible to operate effectively the pacific agencies of international government.

7. Winning Germany and Japan

Whether or not Germany and Japan will again threaten the peace of the world will be decided primarily by the attitude of the English-speaking peoples and of Soviet Russia toward the system of balance-of-armed-power. If this system is maintained, fears will be transferred and new allies will be sought. If continued trust is placed in preponderance of armed might during the next two decades,

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

Germany and Japan will be pulled into one alliance or the other alliance. These two mighty peoples are too strategic and important in the affairs of their respective continents to be ignored, and they cannot long be kept down if there is a severe cleavage between the two combinations of allies, because one side or the other will find it advantageous to strengthen Germany and Japan. Therefore, the Soviet Union is insisting upon full participation in the control of Japan, including the right to veto any policy to which she objects. And therefore both Russia and the English-speaking nations are determined to exercise joint control over Germany. If this fatal split should widen and consequently Soviet Russia should decide to arm Germany, or at least that portion under her control, such action could not be prevented except by resort to war.

If the point is made that Russian hatred of the Germans is too extreme to make this possible, and that such a new alignment is unthinkable because of the intensity of American hatred of the Japanese, one may well draw upon the record of history to show how fickle and changing are the relationships of nations under the system of balance-of-armed-power. Thus far in the twentieth century, Russia fought against Germany, then formed a military alliance with her, then fought against her. Great Britain fought by the side of Russia as an ally, then invaded that land in the early days of the Bolshevik revolution, then waged war against Russia's ally Germany, then fought by the side of Russia as an ally. The United States fought as an ally of Russia, then invaded Siberia and fought against the Russians, then fought with them as an

ally. Russia fought against Japan, then fought as an ally of Japan's ally Germany, then fought as an ally of Japan's enemies Great Britain and the United States, then fought against Japan. Great Britain and the United States fought as allies of Japan, then fought against Japan.

It will be extremely difficult for this generation of Americans to understand the Germans and the Japanese because their behavior has been so barbarous and criminal, and because we have been so thoroughly indoctrinated and propagandized in the massive effort to build and maintain fighting morale. So much so that most people in the United States hold the conviction that it is unwise and impracticable to attempt to deal with the Germans and the Japanese as we treat other peoples because of their inherent and ineradicable aggressiveness and treachery. If this is an unsound conclusion, policies based upon this error will produce calamitous consequences.

The perspective of history is essential to an understanding of the present. Therefore, three long chapters of this volume are devoted to a summary of the origins of the First World War, the causes of World War II, and the reasons for the entrance of the United States into World War II. The conclusion to which I am driven by the evidence is, of course, that the German people and Japanese people were guilty, damnably guilty in numerous ways, but that they responded to their respective situations in much the same guilty way that the rank and file of Americans would have behaved if they had been placed in parallel positions. The evidence is incontestable that German and Japanese leaders were guilty of countless acts of pre-

meditated fiendishness and savagery. But I am thoroughly convinced that the vicious type of leadership hurled into the seats of power in Germany and Japan was determined by the situations confronting them, rather than by innate and unchangeable racial traits of militancy and aggression in the German and Japanese people.

The appropriate policy in relation to Germany and Japan in the future is that of helping these peoples to solve their own problems and of restoring them to equal status in the councils of nations. This policy is in the sharpest possible contrast with the effort to reduce these peoples to a status of the slum-dwellers of the earth. At the end of the First World War, John Maynard Keynes wrote a memorable volume entitled *The Economic Consequences of Peace* in which he pointed out that the ruin of Germany would mean the ruin of Europe. The central truth of that volume is still valid. A low standard of living in Germany will reduce the standard of living throughout the continent. Moreover, it was the economic distress and political frustration of the German people that drove them into Hitler's arms. This thesis is developed at length in a subsequent chapter.

The former standard of living in Japan was low in comparison with American and even European standards, but it was the highest in Asia. To reduce these people to a subsistence level will be economic folly and will lead to economic disaster throughout wide areas of the earth. Moreover, punitive action will never restore them to harmonious relations with other nations. The essence of the policy required is that the Germans and the Japanese be given every assistance in the solution

A MIGHTY MOVEMENT OF PEOPLES

of their own problems, and that they be enlisted in mutual aid in the solution of common problems under the reign of international law functioning through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual confidence.

8. A Mighty Movement of Peoples.

A vast upheaval of peoples around the earth is the hope of preventing a third world war, a mighty protest against the blindness of the military mind and the stupidities of the old diplomacy, a passionate determination to discover the ways of peace and to walk in them. The peace movement which is required must be composed of millions of awakened and resolute individuals, not merely small minorities of thousands. Three groups must be included: those who are filled with revulsion against the barbarities of war and who recoil from the thought of again massacring millions of fellow-men; those who are thoroughly convinced that war is unnecessary and that an effective alternative is found in mutual aid in the solution of common problems under the reign of international law functioning through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual confidence; those who are so deeply committed to the way of high religion that they are unable to approve or support policies which they know will lead to war or to participate voluntarily and directly in any future war.

A substantial basis of hope is found in the fact that most people everywhere are utterly sick of war. For the Germans and the Russians the war has been continuing for thirty years—military hos-

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

tilities, revolution, class conflict, domination by other nations, indoctrination and propaganda, feverish preparedness for war, military hostilities, postwar wreckage and ruin. Germans and Russians under thirty-five years of age have no memories of the days of peace. Only less extreme has been the experience of the British and French and other peoples of Europe. The Japanese and the Chinese have had their fill of the horrors of war. In the United States not one-half of one per cent of the population would like to see war come again. This worldwide revulsion against the cruelties and futilities of war does not in itself afford a guarantee that there will be no more war, but it is an essential and important factor in the struggle to avert war.

The realization is dawning upon millions of minds that war is unnecessary, that alternatives are available and should be utilized. The need for world government is rapidly being recognized by multitudes of individuals all over the earth. Never has there been such determination to limit national sovereignty sufficiently to make possible adequate jurisdiction and power for international agencies of mutual aid and pacific settlement of disputes among nations. Never have so many people been determined to end the insane race of armaments and to bring nations also under the reign of law. Mutual aid is now finding expression in more numerous ways and over wider areas than ever before.

The contrast between the way of war and the way of high religion is being understood by a rapidly growing company of all faiths. The pacifist movement, that is the movement composed of individuals who are unable to approve of the wag-

A MIGHTY MOVEMENT OF PEOPLES

ing of war under any circumstances and who are unable to engage in any war voluntarily and directly, this movement is growing more rapidly than ever before. Pacifists recoil from the bestialities of war; they are determined to find and to use pacific means of settling controversies among nations; and they reject for themselves the method of war and will not use it.

The harnessing of atomic energy and the consequent transformation of war into a means of mutual suicide has greatly accelerated the growth of the pacifist movement. Many who had previously justified the waging of war as the lesser of two evils have now become convinced that the mutual suicide of atomic war is not a lesser evil but a combination of the worst evils in human experience. It is now plain beyond argument that the method of atomic war is in utter contrast to the way of Christ, the way of the cross. The sheer folly of discussing war in the old terms is recognized more and more widely. The necessity of choosing between two ways is now realized by an ever-increasing company. We can wage atomic war, disintegrating cities and slaughtering multitudes of human beings, or we can follow the way of Christ, but it is quite impossible to do both at the same time because no contrast can be sharper than the contrast between promiscuous mass killing and the overcoming of evil with goodness.

So obvious and inescapable is the contrast between the atomic bomb and the cross that the Christian churches are rapidly becoming pacifist. Following the First World War there was an unprecedented growth of Christian pacifism, and after World War II the rate of growth is far more rapid

than in any previous period in history. Even in wartime a substantial minority of clergymen maintained the pacifist position. Multitudes of other ministers were sorely troubled by their even qualified approval of the war method. Now that wartime fears are subsiding and the atomic bomb has so utterly changed the nature of war, there is reason to expect unparalleled growth of pacifism among clergymen. Indeed, I confidently predict that within twenty years Christian pacifism will be acknowledged by a substantial majority of ministers as the orthodox Christian position. Especially rapid also is the growth of Christian pacifism among youth groups and organizations of church women. Within the next few years we may expect conferences, conventions and assemblies of the churches to commit themselves without qualification to the position of Christian pacifism. I have a strong hope that I will live to see the day when the General Conference of the Methodist Church, for example, will officially adopt the Christian pacifist position as the true way of life for all Methodists. In the present hour of world tragedy many millions of Christians are only a step away from the decision to commit themselves without reservation to the way of Christ and the consequent decision to refuse to approve of any future war or to engage in it voluntarily and directly. *It may be that the next decade will demonstrate the fact that no change in Christian thinking in all the centuries was ever so rapid and so complete as the repudiation of the way of war by the Christians of this generation.*

All this is not a guarantee that there will be no third world war because the power of the churches

NEXT STEPS FOR EVERYMAN

may be too feeble to prevent the forces of nationalism and imperialism and militarism from plunging civilization into the holocaust. But the emergence of this powerful movement of revulsion and conviction and commitment offers the most robust of all hopes that war may be averted.

Likewise the rise to power of the British Labor Party is not a guarantee, but it does offer hope. And so it is with the growth of democratic and peoples parties in Europe. The more the masses of people are able to express themselves and the more control they are able to exercise over governmental policy, the less likelihood there is of war in our time. Hope may be found in the collapse of the old society in Europe and Japan. The old property system has been permanently undermined. The concentrated power of aristocracy and money has been broken. Ancient traditions have been shattered and old molds have been fractured. Society is fluid to a degree that has not been known for centuries. Out of the travail and agony of these terrible days there may emerge popular governments in many lands. The people have often been stampeded into war, but the only hope of preventing another great war is the emergence all over the earth of a mighty movement of peoples.

9. Next Steps For Every Man.

What can I do? This question is on the lips of a rapidly growing company of individuals who desire to be worthy members of the mighty movement of peoples so urgently needed if a third world war is to be averted. Let us therefore make a list of things that can be done.

1. Take steps to deepen the realization of the

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

tremendous urgency and vital importance of the effort to prevent another world war, through reading, conversation, attendance at public lectures, and selection of relevant radio programs, forge the resolute determination to take seriously the task of helping to avert the destruction of civilization. Say to yourself day after day: *this is a matter of life and death for millions*. Be wise in the use of time, stop wasting energy in less important ways, spend more hours in helping to build this mighty movement of peoples.

2. Earn the right to discuss world problems by constant study and reflection. Study history and study the contemporary scene. Keep in touch with important books by watching reviews and bulletins from peace organizations. Read periodicals with varying points of view.

3. Assume responsibility for placing some of these sources of information in various libraries and reading rooms. Suggest to librarians the titles of significant books on world affairs. Urge friends to supply themselves with sources of information.

4. Circulate appropriate leaflets and pamphlets about war and peace. Lend good books to your friends. Start a book club and exchange books.

5. Urge your church to provide a special fund with which the minister may buy plenty of good books and subscribe for ample periodicals with which to keep himself informed about world affairs.

6. Engage in conversation, systematic and frequent, about world problems, and seek to arouse friends to a sense of urgency. Intelligent conversation is one of the mightiest of all instruments of public opinion.

NEXT STEPS FOR EVERYMAN

7. Ministers and teachers especially should stress the urgency of war prevention and should give guidance concerning appropriate action.

8. Assume responsibility as a citizen of a democracy for the determination of the foreign policy of this nation by frequent letters to the President, the Secretary of State, the two Senators from your State, and your own Congressman. Also by personal conversation with officials of government when this is possible. Write letters to the correspondence columns of newspapers and periodicals. Praise as well as criticise.

9. Give generously to the relief of war victims and urge Congress to appropriate adequate sums for our share of international relief and rehabilitation.

10. Help to create the will to peace with Soviet Russia and all other nations. Persevere in maintaining that it is safer to continue cooperating with Russia than to prepare to fight her with atomic bombs.

11. Talk incessantly about the need for world government and urge the President and the Secretary of State to cooperate to the utmost in widening the jurisdiction and heightening the prestige and authority of the United Nations Organization. Constantly make use of the analogy of our thirteen states relinquishing sufficient sovereignty to make possible the creation and effective operation of inter-state Federal Government.

12. Deepen and widen the realization that the solving of domestic economic problems is a vital and essential part of the task of preventing another world war. Discuss the importance of the organized labor movement in the efficient distribution of

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

the national income so that consumers can buy and manufacturers can sell. Consider the significance of the world-wide cooperative movement as an agency of peace. Take appropriate action.

13. Stress the significance of racial justice and fellowship in the United States as a vital contribution to international understanding and goodwill.

14. Insist upon the right of the people of India, Puerto Rico and other dependencies to self-government and freedom, and seek to transfer empires into commonwealths.

15. Support the policy of reconciliation with Germany and Japan and thereby help to win these peoples to the ways of peace.

16. Join one or more peace organizations and contribute generously to their budgets.

17. Make a personal decision about the method of war. If you are thoroughly convinced that you should never approve of war and should never engage in it voluntarily and directly, earn the right to announce this decision to your friends and to the community.

18. Be a faithful member of the church of your choice. Endeavor to persuade the local congregation to give official expression to the position that Christians should condemn and oppose preparedness to wage atomic war, including compulsory military training, and should support the alternative method of mutual aid in the solution of common problems under the reign of international law functioning through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual aid. Endeavor to persuade church conferences, conventions and assemblies to take simi-

THE TIME FACTOR

lar action. Help to disentangle the churches from the system of atomic war.

10. The Time Factor.

One of the evil consequences of war is found in the fact that the attitudes and relationships required for military victory also determine the nature of peace treaties. In this sense, every war sows the seed of another war. The League of Nations was poisoned from the beginning by the foul atmosphere of postwar relationships. It is a supreme tragedy that the United Nations Organization was brought into being during a ruthless world war because its very structure was determined by fears and enmities. Its very name signifies a coalition of victors. Failure to include thirteen nations as charter members will long prove to be a source of great weakness.

The ultimate significance of the United Nations Organization is likely to be determined during the next ten years. This same decade will probably decide whether it is to be war or peace between the English-speaking peoples and Soviet Russia. The international situation will improve substantially or it will deteriorate rapidly. Therefore, every concerned individual should be impelled by an overwhelming sense of urgency. Constantly before our eyes should be the ominous warning: **TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE!** This word of doom can properly be pronounced over a high proportion of the diplomatic failures of the past decades. Programs were inadequate and action was too long delayed.

What we do, we must do quickly. Every phase of the task of preventing war must be speeded up. *The work of a generation must be compressed into*

IMPERATIVES OF WORLD PEACE

a decade. To prevent a war with Soviet Russia is a titanic undertaking and time is the essence of the problem. The consequences of failure will be disastrous beyond exaggeration. The release of atomic energy and the annihilation of distance hold over our heads the threat of actual suicide for civilization. Every sensitive person must act with the realization that we are working against time, and must arrange the use of his own time with vivid awareness of the utter urgency of the present world crisis. By the side of the warning: **TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE!** we must place the guiding slogan: **ENOUGH, IN TIME!**

CHAPTER III

THE CHURCHES AND WAR

The time is short and the task is urgent and the responsibility of the churches is inescapable. A mighty peoples' movement for peace and friendship is required and the churches must assume heavy responsibility. This generation of Christians must discover deeper meanings in Jesus and must forge the will resolutely to follow him wherever he leads whatever may be the cost. The devotion and courage with which millions in many lands have served their country must be matched by the loyalty and daring of Christians in following their Lord.

1. The Way of Jesus and the Way of War

The way of Jesus is the way of the home. God is Father and all peoples belong to his family. God is love and all high religion may be found in love of him and love of his people. The primary obligation and the supreme privilege of every man is to live as a good member of God's home.⁷⁹

Jesus knew that divine affection is infinitely more tender and solicitous than human love can be.⁸⁰ Every child is precious to the Father, every individual of every race and every class. The love of God embraces all of his people, weak and strong, ignorant and wise, evil and good. A human mother bending in compassion over an afflicted baby only faintly reflects the yearning of God as he weeps over the people of every Jerusalem. An agonized father by the side of a son who has committed a shameful crime portrays but feebly the anguish of God as he beholds his sons living like hogs in a far country. God's love is all-embracing,

ever-continuing. Nothing can bring to an end the love of God for any one of his children anywhere.⁸¹

The Supreme Being is unwearied in his solicitude and untiring in his efforts to minister to finite sons and daughters. He makes the sun shine and the rain fall on good and bad alike and is kind toward the unthankful and evil. The Father's love flows unceasingly to all of his children from generation to generation. The love of God is broader than the measure of man's mind and the heart of the Eternal is most wonderfully kind. He is the Good Shepherd seeking until the last lost one is found. He is the Father awaiting all prodigals.⁸²

Primitive religion maintains that God loves the righteous and hates the wicked. The Old Testament contains many pages which reflect this conviction. When evildoers repent then God is ready to forgive. It remained for Jesus to realize that God loves the wicked also and actively seeks to save the lost. Rejoice with me! I have found the sheep that was lost. Well may Montefiore, a Jewish scholar, say: "The virtues of repentance are gloriously praised in the rabbinical literature, but this direct search for, and appeal to the sinner, are new and moving notes of high import and significance. The good shepherd who searches for the lost sheep, and reclaims it and rejoices over it, is a new figure."

Another Jewish scholar, Joseph Klausner, says that Jesus "makes far more use of such expressions as 'Father,' 'My Father,' 'My Father in heaven,' than do the Pharisees and *Tannaim*; and often when he employs it, it receives an *excessive* emphasis . . . Arising out of this *exaggerated* sense of nearness to God is Jesus' constant emphasis and

insistence in 'But I say unto you,' as opposed to 'them of old time,' i.e. the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and also the Pharisees . . . Jesus tells his disciples that they must love their enemies as well as their friends, since their 'Father in heaven makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends his rain upon the righteous and upon the ungodly . . .' With this, Jesus introduces something new into the idea of God . . . Such is the Jewish conception of God: the wicked are not worthy that God's sun should rise upon them."⁸³ Many other Jewish scholars disagree with this judgment and maintain that Jesus lifted man to a higher understanding of God's love.

Because God is loving he is also holy.⁸⁴ Only by maintaining his own integrity can he truly serve his children. If God were immoral or treacherous or vindictive he would be unable to minister to his people. If God were indifferent to the moral behavior of men, if he were callous to distinctions between right and wrong, he could never be a worthy Father. Because God is love, he abhors the evil-doing which disfigures and destroys the children in his home. He loves the sinner and loathes the sin. The anguish of a mother over the shameful conduct of her daughter is less severe than the agony of God over the wrongdoing of his people. "Hallowed be thy name," is a prayer that came from profound appreciation of the majesty and holiness of God. The Father desires that the children be like himself and does everything he can do to win them to lives of purity and nobility. He creates and sustains the moral order of the universe, he endows his sons and daughters with the faculties of free moral agents, and he binds

them together with the indissoluble cords of mutuality and interdependence. God endeavors in every possible way to win his children to the wise and right use of their freedom. When he succeeds and is welcomed as companion and guide, good seed are sown and a good harvest is reaped by many and the Reign of God is extended. When God fails to win, and is met with defiance and rebellion, evil seed are sown and the evil harvest is reaped by many until the third and fourth generation.

God never sends an evil harvest. Always he endeavors to win the sower to right doing. When God fails to win, the evildoer brings devastating consequences upon himself and others. The integrity of God makes it impossible for him to change the orderly processes of a moral universe even to prevent terrible suffering for many as the consequence of wickedness. It would be wrong for God to change the moral order of the universe into moral chaos. It would be wrong for God to take away freedom of choice and thereby transform the individual into a puppet which he manipulates. It would be wrong for God to break the ties of interdependence and thereby transform persons into isolated and insulated units immune to all influences from other individuals. God is holy and righteous altogether. He never betrays himself and he never defeats himself. Always he maintains his own integrity, and ever he maintains the dependability of the processes of the harvest. The holiness of God is a manifestation of his great love. His precious gifts to his children include the moral order of the universe, the power to make moral

choices, and the ties that bind in fellowship and cooperation.

The "wrath" of God is a word used to describe the terrible consequences of sowing evil seed. There is no "wrath" of God in the sense that he is resentful, vindictive and vengeful. When a mother holds the hand of a daughter who is suffering torture from a shameful disease contracted in riotous living, she is not filled with rage, nor does she seek to punish the prodigal. The words "vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord" can only mean that the orderly processes of a moral universe operate inexorably and that evil sowing brings forth an evil harvest. A true wife never seeks vengeance against her husband, no matter how grave his infidelity and no matter how revolting his conduct. God is utterly holy and never betrays his own purity of love by tracking down a wayward child and inflicting "punishment" upon him. Always and forever he is the Good Shepherd seeking the lost.

The "judgment" of God is the reaping of the harvest that comes from the sowing. The Father is ever seeking to win and to nurture his children as true members of his home. He wants us to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, clothe the destitute, visit the oppressed, and when he wins us, to that degree we are saved. When he fails to win us because of the use we make of our freedom, we become callous and indifferent and inactive as "goats," and to that extent we are lost. The sheep and the goats are separated by their behavior. There is no "judgment" of God in the sense of a penal verdict. The language of the law court can never portray the relationship of God to his sinful

children. Only the language of the home can reveal the anguish of the Father over his blind and obstinate and rebellious sons and daughters. It was the legalistic approach to God that made it so difficult for the followers of Jesus to understand his own revelation of the heart of God as suffering love. The contract theory is not a proper interpretation of a happy home. The letter of the law killeth, the spirit giveth life. God goes the second mile, he is kind to the wicked, he forgives seventy times seven. If a human parent can live this way in an earthly home, if Jesus can pray for the forgiveness of the men who were killing him, how very much more does God plead with unspeakable yearnings for his covetous and lustful and violent children.⁸⁵

Heaven and hell are relationships, relationships to God and to the other members of his household. To the degree that we love God and the brethren, we are in heaven; to the extent that we neglect and defy God and treat men with malice and contempt and enmity, we are in hell. Literalism and materialism are curses of religion. Early forms of religion were based upon the concepts of contract, breach of contract, penalties. They were materialistic to an extreme degree: God is to be found in a sacred place or a sacred object or on a sacred day; the revelation of God is contained in a sacred book; God is to be worshipped by use of a sacred ritual; access to God is to be mediated through a sacred person. The ministry of Jesus is a continuing endeavor to transform literalism and materialism into the spirit of God's home. With the earlier prophets, Jesus realized that God is not pleased with the blood of lambs and the fat of rams, but ever rejoices over mercy and meekness

and reverence." Not with many washings of hands nor the wearing of purple vestments nor the abstinence of fast days can a son find favor with his Father, but through adoration and companionship and collaboration.

The contemporaries of Jesus were supremely materialistic in their views of hell. Realization of this fact is essential to an understanding of the passage in which Jesus says it is more desirable to cut off a hand or a foot or to cast out an eye than to be cast into hell fire; or the reference of Jesus to him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell; or his words in the parable of the Last Judgment, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels." The word "hell" is a translation of the Greek word "Gehenna," the Valley of Hinnom, a ravine outside Jerusalem where the city garbage was burned. Talmudic theology pictured the mouth of hell as being in this valley, with two palm trees between which smoke arises from the great abyss of fire. The closing verse of the Book of Isaiah gives this gruesome picture of the fate of the wicked: "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

There are two possible interpretations of Jesus' words about hell: he may have been using vivid Oriental imagery in describing the awfulness of rebellion against God; or he may have been expressing his conviction that God sends unrepentant sinners into a literal lake of fire where they burn physically and mentally throughout all eternity.

The former interpretation is entirely consistent with the idea of the inexorable operation of the processes of the harvest in a moral universe. God is forever endeavoring to win his children as good members of his home; when he fails in spite of everything that he can do to draw them into the family circle, the consequences are terrible beyond the vividness of any imagery to describe. A man sends himself to "hell," although God is yearning with unspeakable yearnings to keep him out of that relationship. The parable of the Last Judgment fits perfectly into this interpretation.⁸⁷ The sheep by the relationship of mercy and devotion went away "into eternal life." The goats by the relationship of indifference and inaction went away "into eternal punishment." In his great love the Father maintains the moral order of the universe, treats his children as free moral agents, binds them together with the cords of mutuality, and ever seeks to win them to the right use of their freedom, seeks even until he finds the last lost one.

The other interpretation flatly denies the validity of everything else that Jesus taught about God, and pictures the Supreme Being as vengeful and ruthless beyond the viciousness and cruelty ever manifested by any human being. Not even the most depraved and vindictive parent would take his own children and burn them forever and ever in the unquenchable flames of hottest fire. This abhorrent idea is utterly contrary to Jesus' portrayal of God in his challenge to his disciples to love their enemies in order to be true sons of their Father. Be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect; for-

give your enemies as he forgives his defiant and rebellious children.⁸⁸

God does not possess a dual character, a divided personality. It is wholly inaccurate to present him as sometimes acting in his capacity as Father, and on another occasion taking his place as Judge. God is always Father and ever maintains that relationship to his children, to all of his children all the time under all circumstances. The love of God is an expression of his holiness. He would be false to himself if for a moment he ceased to be loving. He would betray himself if he ceased to maintain the moral order of the universe, if he took away freedom of choice from any one of his children, if he severed the cords of interdependence which bind men together. The reaping that comes from the sowing, the "judgment" of God, comes from the actions of free moral agents in a moral universe where all members of God's family are bound together. The consequences of evil-doing are not the carrying out of a penal verdict.

There is no justification for the contrasting of God's love and God's holiness. God does not use two ways in dealing with his defiant children: "love on the cross" and "justice on the throne." The holiness of God never compels him to do something which is contrary to his love. God does not "impose penalties." Often he is unable to prevent his children from reaping the evil harvest which comes from their wrongdoing. The justice of God is not in contrast to the love of God. His justice is an expression of his love.

Forgiveness is an essential ingredient of love. The dictionary gives this definition of the word "forgive"—"to cease to feel resentment against,

on account of wrong committed." Forgiveness is always offered by love, even though it cannot become fully effective until it is received through penitence and changed behavior. In the parable, the Father forgave the prodigal son long before the son by confession deserved to be forgiven. On the cross Jesus forgave men who did not "deserve" forgiveness. Because God is love, he is forgiving.

With profound insight, Meister Eckhart, in the thirteenth century, wrote: "Nobody ever wanted anything as much as God wants to bring people to know him. God is always ready but we are not ready. God is near to us but we are far from him. God is within; we are without. God is at home; we are abroad."⁸⁹

The love of God stamps precious worth upon every person of every country in every generation.⁹⁰ Even the sparrows are not forgotten by God, nor the other birds of the heaven nor the sheep of his pasture. But man is infinitely more precious than birds or sheep because he is created in the image of God and possesses unlimited capacity to grow in godliness. The spirit of man is kin to the Spirit of God and mutual companionship is possible. The mind of man can be developed and trained to think the thoughts of God. Human emotion can be so disciplined as to reflect the very feelings of God. Conscience can be so attuned as to register the choices of God. The human will can will to do the will of God. Mortal love can respond to divine affection. Man can become a co-worker with God in building the divine family.

So precious is man to God that the Father can never reach his own highest aspirations without a loving response from his children. "You are a

thousand times more necessary to him than he is to you," wrote Meister Eckhart. "For let a man go away or come back: God never leaves. He is always at hand and if he cannot get into your life, still he is never farther away than the door." Because God is love, it is impossible for him to live a remote and isolated existence. The Father by himself cannot create a home; he must receive response from his children. The Wholly Other is a concept which cannot appropriately be applied to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is always nearer than hands and feet and closer than breathing.

The sacredness of personality is derived from the indwelling Spirit of God.⁹¹ The dwelling place of the Eternal is a holy temple, a hallowed sanctuary, a sacred altar. The genuineness of human freedom makes it possible for an individual to barricade the door against God and so neglect the altar fire within that it burns low, but the sacred fire of potential response to God never dies out. Always there is the possibility that it may be fanned into a blaze. And so the personality of even a grossly wicked individual deserves to be treated with reverence. "Twice-born" men in every age demonstrate the possibility of conversion even when the light appears to have gone out.

"Deep within us all," wrote Thomas Kelly, "there is an amazing inner sanctuary of the soul, a holy place, a Divine Center, a speaking Voice, to which we may continuously return. Eternity is at our hearts, pressing upon our time-torn lives, warming us with intimations of an astounding destiny, calling us home unto Itself. Yielding to these persuasions, gladly committing ourselves in body

and soul, utterly and completely, to the Light Within, is the beginning of true life. It is a Light Within which illumines the face of God and casts new shadows and new glories upon the face of men."⁹²

The all-embracing and ever-seeking love of God, and the sacredness of personality because of the possibility of response by the human spirit to the Divine Spirit; these are the supremely important truths about the universe. Vivid realization of these truths and absolute devotion to them constitute the way of Jesus. Respond this day to the appeal of God and treat with reverence every other member of the family. Deepening awareness of the Father's affection, and heightening determination to be more worthy of divine love, transform relationships with other children of God. Here is the key to an understanding of Jesus. He was absolutely certain about the enfolding love of God, and he was moved by the passion to live worthily, to find and to do the will of his Father.

Jesus' awareness of the presence of God, and the surety of his conviction that God is love, these are the supreme spiritual facts of history. It is folly to talk about accepting the ethical principles of Jesus, while at the same time rejecting as invalid his religious experience. Communion with God was the fountain from which flowed all Jesus' basic ideas about life and relationships. His teaching is incomprehensible and impracticable apart from the resources which he found in God. And by the concept "God" he did not mean an abstract idea of the Great Unknowable or the Wholly Other, nor an infinitely remote First Cause, nor a complex symbol for vast impersonal cosmic

energies. The most certain of Jesus' convictions was that God is a personal Being, very near, ever accessible, utterly inescapable. The Supreme Being he called Father with an intimacy and a fervor never known before or since. To this day some interpreters who doubt him say that he was too familiar with the Eternal. The record of his life leaves no doubt, he was far more intimate with God than he was with Simon Peter. Even at the beginning of his ministry he knew that God was saying to him, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased."

So precious was this companionship with God that Jesus' dominant desire was to know and to do what his Father wanted him to do. As he matured, increasing in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man, Jesus reached an unalterable conviction that his Father desired him to live as a loyal member of the divine family. Many a day and many a night he pondered over the meaning of the ancient commandments to love God and to love neighbor. And because he fathomed such depths of God's love, he perceived deeper meaning in love-of-neighbor, keener insights into the nature of love and profounder understandings of the significance of neighbor. Then he was able to realize that all of life's responsibilities may be summed up in the first and second commandments.

The Golden Rule is valid as the highest law only when life is lived on the level of the two great commandments.⁹³ For a self-centered individual to do unto others as he in his covetousness and lustfulness would have them do unto him, is to perpetuate the self-centeredness which is death to all the higher experiences of life.⁹⁴

Jesus' realization of the preciousness of persons to God enhanced their worth in his own eyes. He recognized the image of God in afflicted lepers with their loathsome sores, and he saw the imprint of his Father upon the prodigal daughter in her shame. Jesus knew that God looked with affection upon the rich young ruler, and he understood also that the divine heart yearned over Lazarus with his crumbs from the floor. Nicodemus the devout and Zacchaeus the covetous alike were recognized as precious to God. The blind and the deaf and the dumb, the sick and the afflicted and the paralyzed, all these were loved and served by Jesus because they were of supreme worth to their Father. Jews and Greeks and Romans were known to be kinsmen because they were all sons of his Father. The outcast Samaritan woman with her sordid past and his own beloved mother were known to belong alike to the family of God. The renegade tax-collector who had sold himself to the invaders and the impassioned zealot who sharpened his dagger for the back of his conqueror were known to be brothers in their Father's home.

This spiritualizing of religion, this presentation of the truths of religion in the language of the home, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, was in such sharp contrast with the legalistic and materialistic approach of his contemporaries that Jesus soon discovered that most men of authority and privilege and power were arrayed against him. The reasons for the hostility of the Pharisees is easy to understand when we remember that the nature of religion as they understood it is found in obedience to the Law. Their religion was a revealed religion. They believed

that God delivered to Moses his full and unchanging commandments, which in written text and oral interpretation were passed from generation to generation. The rabbis counted 613 commands in the Law, 248 positive orders and 365 prohibitions. "It was with them an uncontested axiom that every syllable of scripture had the verity and authority of the word of God." The Old Testament is filled with references to the imposition of the death penalty for violations of the Law.

To the ears of the orthodox, Jesus' claim to be Lord of the Sabbath sounded as sheer blasphemy worthy to be punished with death. The contrasts which he made between the old and the new—it used to be said unto you, but I say unto you—were looked upon as utter defiance of God. And they were convinced that Jesus flatly contradicted God when he said that nothing which goes into a man can defile him but only the things which come from within can defile.

The Law commanded the complete ostracism of those who failed to observe its requirements of ceremonial cleansing. This meant that the faithful could not dine with or mingle with socially the am-haaretz or people of the land who failed to follow the prescribed washings of hands and garments. When Jesus recognized the image of God in these people and formed companionships with them, his conduct appeared scandalous to the scribes of the Law. The Pharisees believed that God had ordained segregation as a means of preserving the purity of his own chosen race, but Jesus realized that God abhors segregation and fervently desires all of his children to dwell together in unity. The oppressed contemporaries of

Jesus were filled with hatred of the invading Romans and were engaged in intermittent rebellion to drive them into the sea. Jesus' fellowship with God made it plain to him that the Father loves also his children the Romans. The old way was vengeance seventy-times-seven, the new way is forgiveness seventy-times-seven.⁹⁵

The teaching of Jesus and his behavior convinced the authorities that he was a dangerous heretic, agitator and traitor. Their way was threatened by his way. They could not afford to permit him to live so great was their fear that he would undermine the very foundations of religion and morality and patriotism. Literalism and legalism and materialism in religion would have been destroyed by the triumph of Jesus' way of living every day as a good member of God's family. Persons are more sacred than days and objects and places. Day and object and place were made for man, not man for them. The altar of God is within the holy of holies of every personality, and so reverence should be shown toward every human being under every circumstance. True obedience to God is not found in the burning of flesh upon an altar of wood, nor in the eating of prescribed food only, nor in the meticulousness of fasting and washing. True obedience is to be found in reverent adoration and affectionate loyalty, and in brotherly love and sacrificial devotion to the common good.

Jesus endeavored to win men to God's way as he discovered it in his own experience. When he failed to win those in authority, he was confronted with the necessity of choosing between the abandonment of his unique way or being killed as an

enemy of society. The fact that Jesus was looked upon as Beelzebub, the very incarnation of the prince of the devils, reveals the sharpness of the contrast between his way and their way. No reconciliation between the two ways was possible. The choice before Jesus was abandonment or death.

The intimacy and joy of Jesus' companionship with his Father created in him the dominant desire to do his Father's will at any cost, so he set his face steadfastly toward Jerusalem and determined to bear witness in the very citadel of legalism and ritualism. The brief records we possess do not reveal to us all the reasons for his determination to testify in the holy city, but this we do know, Jesus realized the bitterness of the opposition to him and to his message and was aware of the determination of his opponents to put him to death. He continued on his course because he knew it to be God's will and because he expected God to accomplish a mighty work through his fidelity.

The essence of Jesus' way is revealed most clearly in his attitude in the Garden of Gethsemane and on the cross of Calvary. Many times previously he had decided that above everything else he would rather do God's will. Now the decision had to be made again. The authorities were closing in around him bent upon his destruction. He must make terms with them, or flee beyond their reach, or be killed by them. In the anguish he had to make a final choice. He did not want to die at the hands of those who feared and hated him. He had seen many a man suffering on a cross and had heard many a shriek of agony. As he entered the olive grove in Gethsemane "he began to feel appalled and agitated," to use the language of Mof-

fatt's translation, or according to Weymouth, "began to be full of terror and distress."⁹⁶ Pain and shame and defeat would be his fate if he continued to walk the way of total allegiance to God and complete devotion to the members of God's family. Only by abandonment or escape could his life be saved. So he cried to God for understanding and strength. He wanted to live, but more passionately he wanted to do God's will even if he must die for his fidelity. During this ordeal in Gethsemane Jesus was not an actor faultlessly repeating the lines of a script prepared for him by his Father. On the contrary, he was a free moral agent with power to choose between life and way of life. And from his decision we know that his way is the way of total allegiance to God.

Jesus' prayer on the cross for the forgiveness of those who had plotted his death, reveals the ultimate meaning of love of neighbor, love of God's children even while they are blind and vindictive. Through many hours of precious companionship, Jesus had discovered that the love of God for his children is all-embracing, ever-continuing. Because evildoers also are precious to God, they should always be treated with reverent affection and sacrificial devotion. And so Jesus lived every day as a good member of God's home, even beyond his prayer of forgiveness to the last breath of his earthly existence. With that last breath he whispered his trust in his Father.

God must have suffered extreme anguish as he watched Jesus writhe in pain and desolation. Because Jesus is the supreme revelation of God and because God is as good as Jesus, we know that God remains on the cross so long as his children abuse

their freedom, thereby bringing upon themselves and their victims terrible consequences, and thereby hindering the accomplishment of his holy purpose. Cavalry shows to us more clearly and fully than can be discovered elsewhere in the universe the depth and breadth of God's self-giving, redemptive love for all of his children everywhere.

This is Jesus' way and it is God's way. Build the eternal home of God by living as a good member of the family. God is always true to himself as Father of all his children. He creates and sustains the moral order of the universe, he always treats persons as free moral agents and permits them to make their own choices even when their liberty is used in defiance of his holy will and in the destruction of other sons and daughters. Not even to prevent the worst crime in history would God take away freedom of choice from Judas and Caiphas and Pilate. God's way is to place free moral agents in a moral universe. The Father never betrays himself by manipulating one of his children as a puppet. He always maintains the integrity of the processes of a moral universe even though his children reap terrible harvests from their evil sowing. His sun does not shine as a reward to the righteous, his rain is not withheld as a punishment to the wicked. But the Father does not stand aside indifferently as his children mangle and destroy themselves in abusing their freedom. He is the Good Shepherd seeking the lost, he is the ever-present guest at the door. Nothing that God can do to win his children is left undone. He is true to himself. He always lives as a good member of his own home.

Jesus was true to this way of God. He lived

every day as a good member of God's home. He loved God more than he valued his own physical life. He loved people enough to serve them at the risk of his life. And on the cross he carried love of enemies to its ultimate extreme. This is his way: live today as a good member of God's home, run the risks, take the consequences, trust God.

The scene in the temple is sometimes referred to as evidence that under some circumstances Jesus would sanction war in a righteous cause.⁹⁷ So widespread is this interpretation that we will do well to look carefully at the record. Luke says that he cast out them that sold; Matthew and Mark add that he overthrew the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold doves. John adds that he made a scourge of cords. The King James' translation says that the scourge of cords was used on the men, but these newer translations say that the scourge of cords was used only on the sheep and the oxen, not on the men: American Revised, English Revised, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Weymouth, Williams. In this scene did Jesus abandon the way of love? Did he violate his own teaching? Surely it is clear that it was not physical force that drove the traders from their profitable places of business. One small, improvised cord was not enough. Professor G. H. C. MacGregor says that "The word which in its English dress 'cast out' gives the impression of extreme violence, is frequently used in the New Testament without any such suggestion, e. g., 'Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he *send forth* labourers into his harvest.' The parallel verse in Mark might legitimately be translated without any hint of exceptional violence: 'He entered into the temple, and began to *send out* them

that sold and them that bought in the temple.' Had Jesus used violence, He must inevitably have provoked retaliation and been overpowered by superior numbers. Much more probably it was the compelling 'authority' of His words which overawed His opponents; their conscience condemned them, and they withdrew in disorder. Moral authority, unarmed, triumphed where violence would have been futile."⁹⁸ It was the combination of guilty conscience and the impressiveness of Jesus' moral condemnation of their behavior in corrupting the Father's house. Is it a violation of the way of love to drive out their animals and upset their tables? Jesus did not kill anybody, nor did he threaten anyone with death. There is in this scene no evidence whatsoever that Jesus would ever approve of war or engage in it.

Then there is the verse in Matthew in which Jesus says that he came not to bring peace, but a sword.⁹⁹ There are two possible meanings of this verse. Reference may be made to a literal sword, an instrument of steel. If the passage is accepted literally then its meaning is that some men will confess him, some will deny him, he came to bring an instrument of steel, and to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and to break up the family. The other possible meaning is brought out clearly in the parallel passage in Luke where "division" is used instead of "sword." Some will confess, some will deny, there will be division and that division will be found in the very family circle. There is here not even the remotest reference to armed action.

Consideration should be given to the verse recorded only in Luke where Jesus advised his dis-

ciples to sell cloak and buy sword.¹⁰⁰ When they replied that they already had two swords, he exclaimed, "It is enough." Did he mean literal sword, an instrument of steel, or did he use "sword" illustratively in the sense of thorough preparation for the journey they were about to begin? If he meant an instrument of steel, does it make sense to say that two were enough? This is a difficult passage and scholars have disagreed about its meaning for many hundreds of years. Surely this is an insecure foundation for the argument that Jesus would approve of war under some circumstances.

A passage frequently quoted in support of the idea that Jesus sometimes sanctions war is Mark 12:17: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." This passage begins with the information that Jesus "knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me?" The parallel passage in Luke ends this way: "And they were not able to take hold of the saying before the people, and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace." The meaning is plain: they set a trap, and he refused to walk into it. They tempted him, and he refused to yield to the temptation. If Jesus had advised against the payment of taxes to the foreign Roman government, its agents would have laid hands upon him; if he had advised payment, the fiery Zealots would have been infuriated. Jesus refused to enter the trap. Moreover, what do the words mean: Render unto God the things that are God's? Is government outside God's province?

Even heavier reliance is placed upon the passage Romans 13:1-7, which is frequently quoted

as evidence that a Christian should obey the government when ordered to wage war, especially: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God." Does this passage mean that the Christian should always obey the government? Paul answered no by his behavior, for he was himself imprisoned for disobeying the government. The classic answer of New Testament Christianity is that "We must obey God rather than man."¹⁰¹ Paul was much impressed by the benefits bestowed by the Roman government and was strongly opposed to the Zealots' efforts to overthrow it by violence. The Book of Romans was probably written about 59 A. D., five years before the burning of Rome and Nero's ruthless persecution of Christians, and eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is impossible to believe that Paul looked upon Nero as a divinely ordained ruler to be obeyed without question, even when he ordered Christians to be burned as torches to light his gardens. The evidence is incontestable that thousands of early Christians refused to obey governmental edicts and perished at the hands of governmental authorities.

Reference is also made to the strong words of condemnation recorded in Matthew, where Jesus says that the scribes and Pharisees are hypocrites, whited sepulchres full of dead men's bones, serpents, offspring of vipers.¹⁰² There are two interpretations of these sharp words. First, Jesus lost his temper and departed from his own way of love; second, Jesus was experiencing such an intimate and precious companionship with his Father, and therefrom gained such deep insight into the nature

of God's way, that he was outraged by the victimizing of God's children in the name of religion and cried out in protest. Prophets of an earlier age had beheld the same extreme corruption in religion that Jesus witnessed in the legalism and ritualism of his own day. And there has been many a day since when many officials of Christianity dragged the name of Jesus in the mire. I once devoted several chapters of a book to a citation of much evidence of corruption and degradation in Christian history.¹⁰⁸ Two questions arise: was Jesus speaking the truth in his words of indictment? Was his use of the extreme language of descriptive denunciation a violation of the way of love? Then there is the further question: is it possible that Jesus' actual words were heightened and made more vituperative by the gospel writer in the subsequent days when Christians were bitterly opposed by Jews? The record makes it clear that on several occasions the disciples failed to understand Jesus. Perhaps this passage is a distortion of what Jesus really said. Scholars have long been divided in judgment as to its meaning. It is important to remember that this passage closes with Jesus' lament over Jerusalem and his cry of pity for her children in their distress.

In endeavoring to understand the way of Jesus, emphasis should be placed upon the fact that Jesus did not take part in the armed action of his contemporaries against the conquerors of his land. His refusal to join the Zealots in their armed rebellions against Roman rule may have been due to a judgment that such action was futile, or because he believed his own vocation to be different from that of the armed revolutionists, or because he believed

that it was contrary to God's will to kill enemies.

Many Christians hold the deep conviction that one of Jesus' severe temptations was the temptation to accept the idea that the end justifies the means. If he had yielded and taken up arms against the Romans, he could never have become the world's redeemer. If Jesus had killed Romans he would thereby have violated his own teaching about love of enemies and forgiveness seventy times seven. How could a killer of human beings be the incarnation of God who loves all of his children all of the time with all of his affection?

Jesus was even more concerned about the victims of Roman oppression than were the Zealots with their swords and daggers. Persons were more precious to him than to the armed revolutionists. But his intimate comradeship with God had revealed to him the right way to serve those in need by living as a good member of God's home and endeavoring to overcome evil with good. Jesus realized that God loved the Romans also and was the Good Shepherd seeking them also. How could he kill precious persons whom God was endeavoring to redeem?

From his own experience Jesus learned that the way of the cross is God's way. As he lived faithfully as a good member of God's home, he found out for himself profounder meanings in the prophet's conception of the suffering Servant of God.

For he grew up like a sapling before us,
 Like a root out of dry ground;
 He had no form or charm, that we should
 look upon him,
 No beauty, that we should admire him.
 He was despised, and avoided by men,

THE CHURCHES AND WAR

A man of sorrows, and acquainted with pain;
And like one from whom men hide their faces,
He was despised, and we esteemed him not.
Yet it was our pains that he bore,
Our sorrows that he carried;
While we accounted him stricken,
Smitten by God, and afflicted.
He was wounded for our transgressions,
He was crushed for our iniquities;
The chastisement of our welfare was upon
him,

And through his stripes we were healed.
All we like sheep had gone astray,
We had turned everyone to his own way;
And the Lord made to light upon him,
The guilt of us all . . .
The fruit of his suffering shall he see, and be
satisfied;

Through his affliction shall my servant, the
Righteous One,

Bring righteousness to many,
And he shall bear their guilt . . .
Because he poured out his lifeblood to the
utmost,

And was numbered with the transgressors,
While he bore the sin of many.

And made intercession for the transgressors.¹⁰⁴

The unsurpassed grandeur of this idea became flesh and blood in the person of Jesus as he adored and loved and served God, and as he poured out his affection and forgiveness and sacrificial compassion upon other members of God's family. The idea of the Suffering Servant became the way of Jesus. He loved God and man, ran the risks, took the consequences, and trusted his Father.

The way of the cross and the way of the sword are irreconcilable. Jesus was free to choose one or the other, but he could not at the same time go both ways. Realization of this truth is becoming more widespread among thoughtful Christians year after year. The common conviction of the Protestant and Orthodox churches was expressed at Oxford in 1937 by one of the most representative and impressive conferences of Christians ever to assemble: *"War involves compulsory enmity, diabolical outrage against human personality, and a wanton distortion of the truth. War is a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and him crucified. No justification of war must be allowed to conceal or minimize this fact."*

On the opening page of the report of the Christian theologians appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America its signatories declare: "The ecumenical judgment of the Protestant and Orthodox Churches concerning modern war was pronounced at Oxford in 1937. It has been reaffirmed innumerable times and we affirm it again as our own."¹⁰⁵

The way of Jesus stands out in sharp contrast to the way presented by many Old Testament writers. Jesus realized that his own understanding of God was clearer than that of any other person, so he constantly contrasted his discoveries with previous interpretations: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old . . . but I say unto you."¹⁰⁶ The Christian conviction is that God is revealed in Jesus as he is made known nowhere else: "It was bit by bit and in many different ways that God in

olden times spoke to our forefathers through the prophets, but in these last days He has spoken to us through a son . . . He is the reflection of God's glory and the perfect representation of His being."¹⁰⁷

Revelation requires revealer and receiver. God's ability to reveal is measured by human capacity to receive. On the human level, a mother can reveal much to a five-year-old son, and more to one who is ten, and much more to a mature son. Portions of the Bible were written 1,200 years before some other passages were written. During this period the Hebrews passed through several stages of social evolution. Some of the Old Testament was written by individuals at the five-year and ten-year stages, whereas the writer of the passage interpreting the Suffering Servant was nearing maturity. The idea is now widely accepted that the Bible is a holy book of progressive revelation, or more accurately, a holy book of deepening understanding of God's way. At every step of the way God was endeavoring to reveal himself fully, but always he treated individuals as free moral agents, and never did he manipulate one of his children as an automatic typewriter. God was able to reveal far more to Jesus than he had been able to make clear to primitive writers.

Because so many Christians hold in their minds ideas of God which are sub-Christian, it is advisable to quote several passages which show how extreme is the contrast between some ideas of God in the Old Testament and Jesus' understanding of his Father. Let us begin with a passage from the Book of Deuteronomy. In the third verse of the first chapter we read that "Moses spake unto

- the children of Israel according unto all that Jehovah had given him in commandant unto them.” Among these commandments of Jehovah is the one in the 20th chapter: “When you come to attack a town, offer terms of peace. If the town makes peace with you and opens to you, then all the people to be found in it shall do forced labour for you and be subject to you. But if it will not make peace with you, if it makes war with you, then you must besiege it; and, when the Eternal your God delivers it up to you, then you must kill every male inhabitant without quarter; however, you may seize for yourselves the women and children and animals and all the plunder in the town, enjoying the plunder of your enemies which the Eternal your God has given to you. So you shall treat all towns at a great distance from you, which do not belong to the nations around you. But in the towns of the nations here, which the Eternal your God is giving you for your own, you must not leave a human soul alive; you must put them all to death, Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, as the Eternal your God has ordered you, that they may not teach you to follow all the abominable practices of the worship they offer to their gods.”¹⁰⁸

In the 15th chapter of First Samuel, the King of Israel is ordered to annihilate the Amelikites and destroy all their property. When his victorious soldiers spared King Agag and saved for themselves the booty of battle, Saul the king was rebuked by the prophet Samuel: “Jehovah sent thee on a journey, and said, Go, and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. Wherefore then didst thou

not obey the voice of Jehovah, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah? . . . Then said Samuel, Bring ye hither to me Agag the king of the Amalekites . . . And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before Jehovah in Gilgal.¹⁰⁹

The 137th Psalm exults:

O daughter of Babylon, that art to be destroyed,

Happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee
As thou hast served us.

Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy
little ones

Against the rock.¹¹⁰

Throughout the Psalms, God is portrayed as a God of vengeance and therefore:

The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the
vengeance:

He shall wash his feet in the blood of the
wicked;

So that men shall say, Verily there is a reward
for the righteous:

Verily there is a God that judgeth in the
earth.¹¹¹

In his classic chapter on "The Idea of God," Dr. Fosdick writes: "Some of the major characteristics of Yahweh, the mountain god of Sinai, stand out plainly in the narrative . . . he was a god of war, battling for his people and leading them to victory. The ascription in the so-called Song of Moses,

Yahweh is a man of war:

Yahweh is his name,¹¹²

is typical of the earliest traditions. Concerning the triumph of Joshua on the day when 'the sun

stood still,' we read, 'Yahweh fought for Israel; David defied Goliath, crying, 'I come to thee in the name of Yahweh of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel;' and even a psalmist wrote,

He teacheth my hands to war;

So that mine arms do bend a bow of brass. Indeed, one compiler quotes from a book no longer extant, 'the book of the Wars of Yahweh.' . . . A storm god, dwelling on a mountain, whose major activity was war—such was the beginning of the development of the Jewish-Christian idea of God . . . An integral part of Yahweh's covenant with Israel was his declaration, 'I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries.' Indeed, Yahweh was represented as outdoing Israel in sustained and lethal hatred against non-Israelites, as, for example, the Canaanites."¹¹³

A doctor's dissertation at Columbia University is devoted to a study of *The God of the Old Testament in Relation to War*. "The most characteristic of this early poetic material are seen to be that enemies of Israel are enemies of Israel's God, Yahweh; that wars against these enemies are essentially wars waged by Yahweh; and that Yahweh's methods of fighting are to control phenomena so as to overwhelm the enemy, and to strengthen His own people in their battling for Him.— . . . the God portrayed in the Psalms is usually either the militant henotheistic deity of the Hebrew people or that more powerful but equally partisan God who controls both nature and all history in the interests of one nation. He fights and destroys His own enemies, either hostile nations or the wicked within Israel, and, except when He is temporarily

angry, His might is at the service of His favored ones against their enemies."¹¹⁴

The evidence is overwhelmingly cumulative that some writers of Old Testament passages believed God to be cruel, ruthless, vengeful. The character of God is sometimes pictured in qualities which today are shocking and revolting. It is impossible to reconcile these interpretations with the character of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Old Testament itself contains many profound insights into the nature of God, especially in Amos, Deutero-Isaiah, Jonah, and Isaiah 19:18-25. If the Bible is to be understood, it must be read as progressive revelation, deepening understanding of the character of God. The way of Jesus is the key to an understanding of the Bible, because the Christian conviction is that God is incarnate in Jesus, exhibited in him, with clarity and fullness to be found nowhere else. God is as good as Jesus, and God has ever been that good.

The way of war must be thoroughly examined if its irreconcilable contrast with the way of Jesus is to be understood. This generation has had such intimate and continuous experience with war that many of us fail to realize just what has been happening to the public mind. In 1915 German bombers in Zeppelins dropped explosives on the civilian populations of British cities. The immediate response of most peoples throughout the earth was a feeling of horror that the Huns should be so monstrous and fiendish as to kill men, women and children indiscriminately in crowded cities. When the Nazis bombed the civilian populations of Warsaw and other Polish cities in 1939 they were denounced around the earth as depraved and in-

human beasts, as were the Japanese when they bombed civilian populations in China.

Yet the bombs dropped from Zeppelins in 1915 were mere toys in contrast to the "blockbusters" that made Dresden and other German cities uninhabitable. The Swiss chairman of International Red Cross estimated that 250,000 men, women and children were killed or wounded in Dresden by American bombers. Then came the atomic bombs which wiped out Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with appalling casualties among civilians. Now we are being warned by eminent scientists that atomic bombs vastly more destructive can quickly be produced. Space is being annihilated by super-bombers and rocket bombs with ever-increasing range, speed and carrying capacity. Television, radar, perfected mechanical and electrical devices will enable the bombers of the future to drop annihilating quantities of atomic explosives upon crowded populations throughout the earth. Albert Einstein has expressed the conviction that weapons will soon be available with which quickly to destroy two-thirds of the entire human race.

This complete obliteration of all distinctions between soldiers and civilians means that war has really become totalitarian. *One may safely predict, therefore, that the mind of Christians will rapidly become united in the judgment that the way of totalitarian atomic war cannot conceivably be reconciled with the way of Jesus on the cross.* More than two-thirds of the theologians who signed the report quoted above approved of and supported the war against the Axis powers. Yet the signatories were unanimous in their conviction that "The Church cannot acquiesce in the supremacy of mili-

tary considerations even in war time, nor in the view that modern war may properly, even in case of extreme peril to nation, church, or culture, become total war . . . Faith in and love for the God and Father of Jesus Christ is an ultimate inner standard, real though not external, to which the believer's life at every moment and in every decision is amenable. He cannot choose at will to be judged now by this standard and now by some other—by the standard, for example, of unqualified obedience to some national sovereign, or ultimate devotion to some racial group. Christian faith affirms that God is absolutely good, just, merciful, and that the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and the commitment which it awakens are ultimate realities and norms for every Christian . . . God's will is always that men shall live at peace with one another and with Him. This is true at all times and without any exception . . . It is not God's will that war shall come upon mankind, at any time, nor that it be regarded as a suitable instrument for good." These words were written in wartime and were signed by all members of the commission, including the two-thirds of them who were giving their approval and support to the war. They were written, however, before the use of the atomic bombs, and even before the most annihilating bombing of German cities.

In 1935 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland invited a committee to examine the relation of the church to war. This committee published its report in 1937. In a General Statement its members said: "All are agreed that war in its effects on individuals is an unspeakable outrage on human personality . . . War raises more prob-

lems and more serious problems than those it seeks to settle; and the experience of the world in the last war has taught us that for its successful prosecution it relies on massed suggestion and on campaigns of lies and deceit. It rouses such antagonisms as to make it hardly possible to view the enemy as a brother man for whom Christ died." In a section entitled "The Non-Pacifist Position," we read: "It is often argued that, even in a defensive war, the most effective defence will be offence. But for Christians, ethical considerations can never become irrelevant; and, even when victory may seem at stake, the Church cannot admit that military operations, whether by bombing or otherwise, which have the civil population, including women and children, as their deliberate objective can ever be brought within the definition of legitimate 'defence'." ¹¹⁵

One may safely predict that the cumulative evidence that war has already become totalitarian will soon create a common conviction among Christians throughout the earth that a decisive choice must be made between the way of Jesus and the way of totalitarian atomic war. *When Christians generally come to realize that support of modern war means repudiation of the way of Jesus, they can be trusted to reject the way of war and to commit themselves anew to the way of the cross.*

This decision will be hastened and strengthened by the realization that preparedness to engage in totalitarian atomic war will prove to be morally and spiritually stultifying and paralyzing. The effects will be absolutely devastating if the American people reach the conclusion that they can defend their homes and the values they cherish only

by preparedness for mass annihilation. This would be in effect actual rejection of the way of Jesus. It is not possible simultaneously to have faith in the way of the cross and to place confidence in atomic bombs and the obliteration of entire populations. The deadening and benumbing of the public mind which has become progressively more extreme since the days when first the Germans bombed civilian populations in England will continue to become more paralyzing if nations go on with preparedness to massacre men, women and children in unlimited numbers. *If the churches consent to preparedness for totalitarian atomic war they will be met with derision and scorn when they use the phrases about taking Jesus seriously and about the gospel being the power of God unto salvation.*

2. *The Record of the Churches.*

The nature of the decision which the churches are now called upon to make will be understood more clearly if we will again examine the record of the churches in relation to war through the centuries.

In the paragraphs above we have attempted to summarize the basic elements in the way of Jesus and have reached the conclusion that there is an irreconcilable contrast between his way and the way of war. The conviction is inescapable that if Jesus had joined the Zealots in the use of arms against the Romans, he would thereby have disqualified himself for the holy mission of revealing the way of God to man. It was the will of God that he walk the way of love even though he for-

feited his life because of his fidelity. Jesus walked that way and trusted God.

The members of the early churches were in message and behavior strongly opposed to war, but not in an unqualified way. Down to the time of Constantine there were frequent utterances against participation in war by Christians, especially against combatant service and the killing of human beings. For most Christians in that early period the problem of war did not present itself acutely because few of them were called upon to engage in armed fighting. There was no military conscription and the army was maintained by volunteers. Slaves and former slaves were not eligible for enrollment in the army. Moreover, the issue was confused because men in the army engaged in numerous types of activities remote from combat duty. Most police functions were exercised by soldiers. An individual might wear the military uniform for a score of years and never be called upon to kill an enemy. Furthermore, the Empire afforded a high degree of security from the Rhine and Danube to the Euphrates. Pirates and brigands had been suppressed.

The evidence for this period has been summarized by Professor Roland H. Bainton of Yale in these words: "From the end of the New Testament period down to 170-80 we have no evidence of any Christians in the army and also no statement that a Christian would be excluded from the Church were he to join the ranks . . . Christians were suffered to remain in the army so long as they were engaged only in tasks entailing no shedding of blood . . . Military service in war is nowhere commended and often condemned by Christian

authors of the age of persecution . . . The pacifists of the early Church were the writers and the leaders."¹¹⁶

The most comprehensive study of this problem is that of Professor Cecil John Cadoux of Oxford entitled, *The Early Christian Attitude Toward War*.¹¹⁷ This work contains a detailed examination of the writings of the early church fathers. The author's conclusion is thus stated: "The early Christians took Jesus at his word, and understood his inculcations of gentleness and non-resistance in their literal sense. They closely identified their religion with peace; they strongly condemned war for the bloodshed which it involved; they appropriated to themselves the Old Testament prophecy which foretold the transformation of the weapons of war into the implements of agriculture; they declared that it was their policy to return good for evil and to conquer evil with good. With one or two possible exceptions no soldier joined the Church and remained a soldier until the time of Marcus Aurelius, 161-180 A.D. Even then, refusal to serve was known to be the normal policy of Christians—as the reproaches of Celsus (117-180 A.D.) testify . . . No Church writer before Athanasios ventured to say that it was not only permissible, but praiseworthy, to kill enemies in war, without the qualification—expressed or implied—that he was speaking of pagans only."¹¹⁸

Yet the early Christians stopped short of an unqualified condemnation of war. They were not willing to say that the wars recorded in Hebrew history were wrong and should be condemned. Nor were they prepared to condemn the Messianic wars predicted in the Apocalypse. Frequently the

writers of that early period used war as an illustration of the Christian life, and often they praised the military virtues.

On the other hand, there are numerous condemnations of war in the literature of that period, and there were many reasons why Christians would be unwilling to become soldiers, including: the shedding of blood on the battlefield, the use of torture in the law-courts, the passing of death-sentences by officers and the execution of them by common soldiers, the unconditional military oath, the all-pervading worship of the Emperor, the sacrifices in which all were expected in some way to participate, the average behavior of soldiers in peacetime, and other idolatrous and offensive customs.¹¹⁹

The early Christians were strongly opposed to war, but they were not absolutely opposed to it. As the age of persecution passed and the churches became stronger and more popular, opposition to war steadily diminished. Within a single generation, at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth, Christianity was transformed from an illegal and persecuted status into an approved religion with the Roman Emperor as its head.

The story of Constantine's conversion is well known.¹²⁰ He grew up in a religious home where monotheism was accepted and was therefore favorably disposed toward the new religion. In the campaign of 312 against his colleague Maxentius he was directed in a dream to place the monogram and Cross of Christ on the shields of his soldiers. When he obeyed these instructions and won a great victory at Milvian Bridge he attributed his

success to the power of Christ and began to extend favors to the church and soon put Christianity on a basis of equality with official paganism. After he became sole emperor in 323 he used all his influence on behalf of the new religion and in opposition to the old cults. Throughout the remainder of his career he was devoted to the church and was baptized just before his death in 337.

It has been said that the four stages of Constantine's attitude toward the church were sympathy, justice, patronage, and control. He certainly became the patron and ruler of the church, but the evidence is clear that he neither understood nor practiced the religion of Jesus. The Cross of Christ, instead of being a way of life to be followed, became a magical charm, a fetish, a luck token. By this time the cross had come to be widely used by Christians as a magical sign before which demons fled. To the very end Constantine's chief conception of Christianity was that of a cult whose prayers and emblems enabled him to triumph in military conflicts and political crises, and whose rites insured eternal salvation. He retained the title of Pontifex Maximus, or high priest of the pagan hierarchy, to the very close of his life, as did his successors until 375. After his death the Roman Senate enrolled him among the gods of the heathen Olympus.

During Constantine's reign Christianity became a religion of war, from which it has never been divorced to the present hour. Henceforth the Roman legions fought under the banner of the Cross and carried the monogram of Christ on their shields, in place of the imperial eagle. When his mother Helena brought from Jerusalem two nails

which were supposed to have been taken from Jesus' cross, Constantine used one on his helmet and the other on the bridle of his war horse. By 416 only Christians were allowed to serve in the army!¹²¹ Pagan warriors need not apply!

The moral character of Constantine bore little resemblance to that of the founder of the religion which he professed. After he has been given due credit for many noble qualities, it must be admitted that very often his conduct was quite repulsive. His oldest son, Crispus, was the son of a concubine, Minervina; and either Constantius or Constantine II, born within a few months of each other, was also illegitimate. It was after his conversion that he murdered his conquered colleague and brother-in-law, Licinius; sentenced to death his eleven-year-old nephew; killed his oldest son, Crispus; and brought about the death of his second wife, Fausta, perhaps by suffocation with steam. Yet this semi-pagan and cruel emperor has been canonized as a saint by the Greek Church, and to this day that ancient communion celebrates his memory as "Equal to the Apostles." And concerning his conversion a leading church historian says: "Galilean, thou hast conquered! The ruler of the civilized world lays his crown at the feet of the crucified of Nazareth." What really happened was the capture of the Christian church by a pagan warrior.

From that hour to the present day, the churches have been entangled in the war system. The process of disentangling will be accelerated if we understand clearly how shameful is the record of the churches in relation to war during the past sixteen hundred years. In no other respect has there been a more striking contrast between or-

ganized Christianity and the religion of Jesus than in the conduct of the Crusaders during the two hundred years of their history. Throughout this long period the church instigated, blessed, and often, in the person of some high prelate, led the Crusades. These followers of the Cross were guilty of massacre, treachery, robbery, sexual excesses, and almost every other sin and crime imaginable. The stench they created pollutes the nostrils of Moslems of this day.

From 1095 to 1291 the Christian church never abandoned the struggle to redeem the Holy Sepulchre from blasphemous hands. Crusade after crusade was waged. In order to recover the grave of our Lord hundreds of thousands of his followers lost their lives and an unnumbered multitude of "infidels" were slain. One authority gives four other reasons for the Crusaders: the decay of the Eastern Empire; the consequent danger of encroachment by the Arabs and Turks; the relative unity of Europe and the growth of the commercial spirit; and the system of penance.

It is almost impossible for modern Christians to appreciate the depth of emotion which swept over medieval Christendom at the thought of the tomb of Christ being in the hands of Mohammedans. The vilest of calumnies against the Moslems were blindly received by credulous members of the church. No tale of inhumanity was too horrible to be accepted. In an age when relics and images received reverent adoration from the faithful, it was simply unbearable that the most holy relic of all should be defiled by infidels. The Holy Land was the motherland and the fatherland. No one hundred per cent patriot can possibly be as deeply

outraged by the desecration of his nation's flag as pious churchmen were scandalized by pagan pollution of holy places. Long before the Crusades began large numbers of pilgrims endured incredible hardships and perils in order to set foot upon the sacred soil, especially at those periodic intervals when the end of the world was prophesied. The devout mind could conceive of no greater glory than to be in Jerusalem at the hour of the triumphant return of Christ.

Vast enthusiasm for the Crusades was created by the offer of a plenary indulgence; that is, full remission of all works required by the sacrament of penance, to those who would "take the cross," as enlistment was called. Priests and bishops and popes agreed that all those who fell in the holy war were assured of eternal salvation; while excommunication was threatened against those who broke their vow. They were also freed from arrest for debt and from usury. Moreover, the church assumed the guardianship of their families. The spirit of adventure moved many in that age, as in every other. Escape from monotony and hard labor has ever been sought by masses of people. The desire for gain was also operative. Alluring pictures of plunder of the fabulous wealth of the East were drawn. The story of Tancred's six camel-loads of spoils, for example, swept over Europe and aroused the utmost enthusiasm. All these factors combined to produce a motley company, "with debtors and criminals abounding."

The officials of the church went to the wildest extremes in seeking to arouse Christendom. Before a vast assembly in 1097 Pope Urban II said: "If you must have blood, bathe your hands in the

blood of infidels. I speak to you harshly, because my ministry obliges me to do so: soldiers of hell become soldiers of the living God." Whereupon the multitude shouted: "It is the will of God."¹²¹ Bernard, the holiest man of his century, cried out: "The din of arms, the dangers, the labours, the fatigues of war, are the penances that God now imposes upon you. Hasten then to expiate your sins by victories over the infidels . . . Cursed be he that does not stain his sword with blood."¹²² In 1188 the Pope ordered prayers against the Saracens to be said daily. All Crusaders wore the cross sewn on their garments. Many were known to have burned the mark of the cross into their flesh. The Gospels were often borne aloft in battle.

The ferocity with which the Christian armies fought and the ruthlessness with which they slaughtered their foes have rarely, if ever, been surpassed in the history of warfare. The capture of Jerusalem at the conclusion of the First Crusade was accompanied by deeds of the wildest savagery on the part of the Christian soldiers. "Neither age nor sex were spared. Childrens brains were dashed out against the stones, or their living bodies were whirled in demoniacal sport from the walls. Women were outraged." In a letter to the Pope, Godfrey said that in Solomon's Porch and in the Temple the Crusaders rode in Saracen blood up to the knees of their horses.¹²⁴ It is said that Godfrey himself did not join in the massacre but instead spent the time quietly engaged in prayer in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The pillaging and slaughtering continued for a week. An eyewitness wrote that "not even a suckling child, male or female, escaped from the hands of the slayers."

At the siege of Nicaea the Crusaders cut off the heads of a thousand prisoners and hurled them from catapults over the walls of the city. In describing the capture of that fortress, Anselme of Ribemont wrote to the Archbishop of Rheims: "Our men, returning in victory and bearing many heads fixed upon pikes, furnished a joyful spectacle for the people of God." Bohemond commanded that Syrian spies should be spitted and roasted. The Christians once sent four camel-loads of human heads to the Egyptian ambassador.¹²⁵ The Pope's legate at the siege of Antioch, Bishop Puy, advised the Crusaders to cut off the heads of the Saracens, stick them on lances, and expose them to the enemy on the ramparts.¹²⁶ And when the victory was won the warriors of the cross "contemplated with joy fifteen hundred heads separated from their trunks, which were paraded in triumph through the army."¹²⁷ The Crusaders were known to have burned the dead bodies of their foes in order to secure the coins which they believed had been swallowed. Before the walls of Antioch the famished Christians devoured the putrid flesh of the Turks they had slain.

Not only did the Crusaders ruthlessly slaughter infidels, they sometimes released their fury against their fellow Christians. In 1204 they captured and looted Constantinople, the capital of Eastern Christendom. The entire city was plundered. One narrator boasted: "Never since the world was created was there as much booty gained in one city." Tombs were robbed. Women were outraged. Churches were desecrated. Horses were ridden into the sanctuary. Communion cups were used in drunken revels. Prostitutes danced upon the sacred

altar. All this was part of the holy war against sacrilegious infidels.

In the thirteenth century a crusade was organized against the Albigenses, a heretical sect. Christian was now pitted against Christian. The Dominicans were intrusted with the responsibility of preaching the Crusade and arousing the enthusiasm of the faithful. The Third Lateran Council proclaimed indulgences for those who enlisted in the holy war. Eternal life was promised to those who perished, and two years' remission of penance to all who survived.

More than twenty thousand knights and two hundred thousand footmen rallied to the standard of the Cross. The city of Beziers was taken by storm, the scene that followed being described by the Papal legate in these words: "Our men, sparing neither rank nor sex nor age, slew about twenty thousand souls with the edge of the sword; and, making a huge slaughter, pillaged and burned the whole city, by reason of God's wrath wonderfully kindled against it."¹²⁸ More than five hundred castles and towns were captured and the whole countryside "reduced to the appearance of a desert." Professor J. B. Mullinger of Cambridge tells us that during a period of two years there occurred "long series of plunderings and massacres, accompanied by almost unprecedented atrocities."¹²⁹

During the Albigensian crusade, severe measures were also taken against the Waldenses, another heretical sect. In 1210 the Archbishop of Turin drove the Waldenses out of his diocese. In Mayence and Bingen fifty were burned at the stake. For the next three centuries they were subjected to intermittent persecution, the period of the greatest

suffering coming about the middle of the Seventeenth Century, when nine thousand were killed in battle and twelve thousand carried off as prisoners.

At the sack of Munster the army of a Catholic bishop mercilessly slaughtered Anabaptists. Men and women were thrown from windows and caught on spears below. Three of the heretical leaders were exhibited in an iron cage, tortured with hot pinchers, their tongues torn out; and finally they were stabbed to death. The cage containing their dead bodies was then hoisted high on the tower of the Church of St. Lamberti, where the remains "hung undisturbed except by wind and storm, for three centuries and a half." We were solemnly assured, in a volume published by the Harvard University Press in 1925, that they were still hanging there when the First World War broke out.¹³⁰

In 1524 Thomas Munzer, pastor of the church in Zwickau and leader of an extreme wing of the Protestants, took up arms on behalf of the German peasants. His fiery appeal to his followers to take up arms included these words: "Arise, fight the battle of the Lord! On! on! on! Now is the time! The wicked tremble when they hear of you. Be pitiless! Heed not the groans of the impious! On! on! on! while the fire is burning; on while the hot sword is yet reeking with the blood of the slaughter! Give the fire no time to go out, the sword no time to cool. Kill all the proud ones."¹³¹ Unfortunately for Thomas, the enemy was too strong, with the result that he was beheaded and one hundred thousand peasants were slaughtered before the war was ended.

During the century following the birth of the

Reformation in France, nine successive wars, covering a period of sixty years, were waged between the Christians of that country. "Bands of robbers and ravishers," says Dr. Preserved Smith, "under the names of Christian parties but savages at heart, put the whole people to ransom and to sack. Indeed, the Wars of Religion were like hell." On the eve of St. Bartholmew's Day, 1582, Admiral Coligny, leader of the Huguenots, was assassinated by Catholic officials of state and the systematic annihilation of Protestants begun. Before noon of the next day two thousand victims were slaughtered in Paris alone. News of the massacre were celebrated by Catholics in Rome with hymns of praise and rejoicing. The Cardinal of Lorraine congratulated the king on the "very Christian and heroic deliberations and executions, made, not only in Paris, but all through the chief towns—better than I could have expected or desired."¹³² The number of persons slain has been variously estimated from ten thousand to twenty thousand. During the siege of Paris in 1590 by Henry IV the suffering of the inhabitants became so acute that they ate dogs, cats, and rats. The bones of animals and even dead persons were ground up and used as flour. Thirteen thousand people died of starvation and twenty thousand succumbed to fever.¹³³

The most sanguinary fighting of all religious wars took place in the Netherlands.¹³⁴ Philip II of Spain boasted that he would bring the Protestants of the Low Countries back to the fold of Rome or "so to waste their land that neither the natives could live there nor should any thereafter desire the place for habitation." Every fiendish device imaginable was resorted to. Because he trampled

upon the sacred wafer, Le Blas, a velvet manufacturer of Tournay, was tortured to death by having his right hand and foot twisted off between red-hot irons, his tongue was torn out by the roots, and he was then swung to and fro over a slow fire until he was roasted. The inquisitor Titelmann convicted John de Swarte, his wife and four children of "reading the Bible, and of praying in their own doors, and had them all immediately burned."¹³⁵ After the Inquisition had taken its horrible toll of many thousands, one authority placing the figure as high as fifty thousand, the Protestants revolted and were guilty of many excesses. Philip replied by sending an army of Spanish veterans under the leadership of the infamous Duke of Alva, of whom Motley said: "Such an amount of stealth and ferocity, of patient vindictiveness and universal bloodthirstiness, were never found in a savage beast of the forest, and but rarely in a human bosom." Within six years this monster executed from six thousand to eighteen thousand heretics and rebels. "Columns and stakes in every street, the door-posts of private houses, the fences in the fields were laden with human carcasses, strangled, burned, beheaded. The orchards in the country bore on many a tree the hideous fruit of human bodies."

When Zutphen was captured Alva sent orders to his son to kill every man in the city. Some were stabbed, some were hanged, some were drowned, and many stripped of their clothes and driven out to freeze in the snow. Similar punishment was meted out to the inhabitants of many other cities. In Naarden five hundred men and women were assembled in the Gast Huis church and slaughtered

like sheep, after which the church was burned, consuming the dead and dying. The entire city was then sacked by Spanish soldiers of the Cross. Women were outraged on the very altars of churches. Burial of the dead was forbidden and for three weeks innumerable corpses polluted the streets. One of the cavaliers who participated in this butchery wrote: "The sack of Naarden was a chastisement which must be believed to have taken place by express permission of a Divine Providence." During the two days following the capture of Antwerp the Catholic soldiers murdered not less than eight thousand victims. "Hell seemed emptied of its fiends," commented Motley.

In the end, however, the Protestant forces under the leadership of William the Silent were victorious and threw off the Spanish yoke. In the course of the long years of fighting they also were guilty of many atrocities. During the siege of Haarlem, for example, they hanged a number of prisoners, including a twelve-year-old boy, and drowned several women. At Gorkum fifteen Franciscans were horribly mutilated and then hanged. Diedrich Sonoy, governor of a portion of southern Holland and a supporter of William of Orange, accused Manning Koppezoon of being a Catholic and plotting conflagration and tortured him mercilessly. After the body of the victim had been "singcd from head to heel, and his feet almost flayed, he was left for six weeks to crawl about his dungeon on his knees. He was then brought back to the torture rooms and again stretched upon the rack, while a large earthen vessel, made for the purpose, was placed, inverted, upon his naked body. A number of rats were introduced under this

cover, and hot coals were heaped upon the vessel, till the rats, rendered furious by the heat, gnawed into the very bowels of the victim, in their agony to escape. The holes thus torn in his bleeding flesh were filled with red-hot coals . . . The final sentence ordained that his heart should be torn from his living body, and thrown in his face, after which his head was to be taken off and exposed on the church steeple of his native village. His body was then to be cut in four, and a quarter fastened upon different towers of the city of Alkmaar."¹³⁶

All the wars waged by the United States have received the sanction and support of the churches. True enough, ecclesiastics were divided in their loyalties during the Revolutionary War, many ministers being sympathetic with the Tories. But practically all were agreed as to the righteousness of war in a just cause. In a sermon before the University of Oxford on December 13, 1776, Myles Cooper, President of King's College, later Columbia University, in New York City, referred to the war in these words: "If it be right in a Sovereign State to attempt the forcible suppression of a wicked and unprovoked Rebellion, after all persuasive methods had failed, then the War is just, on the part of the Government . . . Never was there a more worthy Object of Military Exertion; never was the Power of any Nation better employed! . . . Having made the necessary Preparation for the important and unavoidable Contest, we are now to put our trust in Almighty God for Success; and implore his Blessing on our Fleets and Armies."

During the Civil War a parallel situation arose, the churches generally upholding the cause of the governments of the regions in which they were

located. With the exception of a few pacifist groups, however, the churches supported one side or the other.¹³⁷ The slavery controversy split the Methodist Episcopal church and the Baptist church each into two divisions. The Methodists of the North were so vigorous and enthusiastic in their support of the war that Abraham Lincoln was able to write to the General Convention of 1864; "It is no fault in others that the Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospitals, and more prayers to heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Church! bless all the Churches!"¹³⁸

In the *Boston Review*, a periodical devoted to theology and literature, for May, 1863, there appeared an unsigned article on "The Sword and Christianity," from which the following words are taken: "War is not the greatest evil in the world . . . There has been nothing yet found among men like the smell of gunpowder, for making a nation perceive the fragrance of divinity in truth . . . No people ever did, or ever could, feel the power of Christian principle growing up like an inspiration through the national manhood, until the worth of it had been thundered on the battlefield."

Another unsigned article in an earlier issue said: "We are prepared to maintain that the war, on the part of the North and West, is, in its proper foundations and objects, a Christian and most religious war . . . If the entire armed host of the United States, from the commander-in-chief to the lowest subaltern, was made up of sturdy Puritans and Calvinists, with the Bible in one pocket and the Assembly's catechism in the other, all singing . . . 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow,' to

the tune of 'Old Hundred,' the spectacle, to our mind, would be perfect in its concinnity, and sublime as when Michael and his angels fought against the dragon and his angels."¹³⁹

In 1863 the Reverend Henry Whitney Bellows, D.D., said: "To rally round the President—without question or dispute—is the first and most sacred duty of loyal citizens, when he announces, not that the Constitution merely, but that the National life and existence are in peril. He is the official judge of this . . . Thus brethren, do I commend to you the cause of unconditional loyalty." The Reverend Doctor Pinckney, pastor of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Ascension in Washington and subsequently Bishop of Maryland, was barred from his own church by a guard of bayonets on the ground that he refused to pray for a Northern victory. Horace Bushnell, one of the most eminent ministers of the North, said in a sermon: "Peace will do for angels, but war is God's ordinance for sinners."

The churches of the South were solidly behind the Confederacy. "Had Jefferson Davis been approached on the subject," says Professor C. B. Swaney, "he could have written an appraisal of the loyalty of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which with all due regard to the facts would have rivaled the statement of President Lincoln to the General Conference of 1864" *The New Orleans Christian Advocate* said: "The truth is, it is a religious war. It is a defense of the rights of conscience." *The Owachita Conference Journal* urged the people to "war against unbelief, lying, cheating, abolitionism, whiskey and the devil; and in humble faith anticipate the day when the land

shall have her rest and be overspread by a Sabbath Day of holiness." Dr. Carnes, editor of the *Texas Christian Advocate*, commanded a regiment made up primarily of Methodist preachers and laymen.¹⁴⁰ *The New Orleans Christian Advocate* was merely voicing the universal sentiment of Southern churchmen when it wrote: "Southern people feel profoundly that . . . they are fighting for the only true Christian civilization they can ever enjoy . . . Slavery is rapidly coming to be regarded as a providential system of African civilization . . . Southern men defend slavery now upon the same principles and with the same spirit as they do their religion, their homes, their wives and children, their personal honour and independence."¹⁴¹

From 1914 to 1918 the churches in all belligerent lands gave their approval and support to the waging of war by their respective governments. Christians in Germany and in France alike waged war in the name of God. When the United States became a belligerent, clergymen and laymen alike supported the war, with only a handful of dissenting pacifists. When Ray Abrams assembled the material for his *Preachers Present Arms* he could find the names of only a few hundred ministers who stood out against the war. In all the land there were fewer than 4,000 registered conscientious objectors, and only 450 of these refused to accept some form of alternate service.¹⁴²

One of the most extremely bellicose clergymen was Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis of Brooklyn who cried out: "Society has organized itself against the rattlesnake and the yellow fever. Shepherds have entered into a conspiracy to exterminate the

wolves. The Boards of Health are planning to wipe out typhoid, cholera and the black plague. Not otherwise, lovers of their fellow men have finally become perfectly hopeless with reference to the German people. They have no more relation to the civilization of 1918 than an orang-outang, a gorilla, a Judas, a hyena, a thumbscrew, or a scalping knife in the hands of a savage. These brutes must be cast out of society . . . We know that Tacitus said, nearly two thousand years ago, that 'the German treats women with cruelty, tortures his enemies, and associates kindness with weakness.' But nineteen centuries of education have not changed the Germans one whit . . . In utter despair, therefore, statesmen, generals, diplomats, editors are now talking about the duty of simply exterminating the German people. There will shortly be held a meeting of surgeons in this country. A copy of the preliminary call lies before me. The plan to be discussed is based upon the Indiana State law. That law authorizes a State Board of Surgeons to use upon the person of confirmed criminals and hopeless idiots the new painless method of sterilizing the men. The surgeons are preparing to advocate the calling of a world conference to consider the sterilization of 10,000,000 German soldiers and the segregation of their women, that when this generation of Germans goes, civilized cities, states and races may be rid of this awful cancer that must be cut clean out of the body of society . . . It is our duty to forgive the transgressor who is repentant but it is a crime to forget the unspeakable atrocities of the German Kaiser, the German War Staff, and the German army."¹⁴³

The Reverend George Parkin Atwater ex-

claimed: "The complete representative of the American Church in France is the United States Army overseas . . . The army today is the Church in action, transforming the will of the Church into deeds, expressing the moral judgment of the Church in smashing blows. Its worship has its vigil in the trenches, and its fasts and feasts; its prayers are in acts, and its choir is the crash of cannon and the thrilling ripple of machine guns."¹⁴⁴ Dr. James A. Francis, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Los Angeles, said: "I look upon the enlistment of an American soldier or sailor as I do on the departure of a missionary for Burma."¹⁴⁵

For sixteen hundred years the record has been unbroken, a majority of Christians has approved and supported every war waged by a so-called Christian nation; indeed, Christians have supported both sides of every conflict among so-called Christian powers. The churches of the North supporting one side, and the churches of the South supporting another, this is one illustration of an invariable practice for sixteen hundred years. The historian Westermarck records the opinion that "it would be impossible to find a single instance of a war waged by a Protestant country, from any motive, to which the bulk of its clergy have not given their sanction and support. The opposition against war has generally come from other quarters . . . War is in our days, as it was in those of Erasmus, so much sanctioned by authority and custom, that it is deemed impious to bear testimony against it."¹⁴⁶

Another historian who examined the record carefully said: "In looking back, with our present

experience, we are driven to the melancholy conclusion that not only has ecclesiastical influence had no appreciable effect in diminishing the number of wars, but that it has actually and very seriously increased it. We may look in vain for any period since Constantine, in which the clergy, as a body, exerted themselves to repress the military spirit, or to prevent or abridge a particular war . . . With the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries."¹⁴⁷

At the end of the First World War the tide of the centuries began to turn rapidly and the movement against war acquired unprecedented strength. The fact that this movement was too feeble to prevent World War II should not blind us to its immense significance. Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, Director of the Research Department of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, who does not include himself as a pacifist, wrote: "*From a sociological point of view the pacifist crusade which swept the country in the twenties and thirties was an extraordinary phenomenon. Indeed, it is perhaps the most impressive single example of the power of propaganda for an idea that our history records. And here the word 'propaganda' is used in a purely descriptive sense to characterize a remarkable movement. Its strength lay very largely in the fact that those who became purveyors of its philosophy were among the most intellectual, liberal, and socially minded, and therefore the most broadly influential, of the ministerial leaders. The movement had the support of some of the most ably edited religious journals, and it*

produced a pamphlet literature of a vigorous and convincing sort. The influence of the spoken and written word, unsupported by vested interest of any kind, has perhaps never been so strikingly demonstrated . . . Christian pacifism became an indubitably authentic movement, the influence of which is strongly felt in the religious life of America now that we are at war. To a large and influential portion of the Protestant leadership war had become anathema before the blow fell at Pearl Harbor, and no clear 'testimony' in support of the war has taken form in Protestant circles."

During World War II the Christian pacifist movement not only maintained its vitality but substantially increased its strength. The proportion of drafted men who refused to enter combatant service was small, but comparatively the number who selected non-combatant service with the armed forces, and who chose Civilian Public Service, and who were imprisoned because they were denied civilian service or because they were unwilling to accept any form of conscripted service—this total was incomparably higher than it had been during the First World War. An impressive change in attitude was visible in the rank and file of church members. Most of them supported the war uneasily and many congregations loyally upheld a pacifist minister. Comparatively few clergymen lost their positions because of opposition to the war. Many a laymen was heard to say: "I don't always agree with our minister, but I respect him for preaching his convictions." The public attitude toward conscientious objectors was friendly and appreciative to a degree not known before. During the war the growth in membership of paci-

fist organizations was the most rapid in history.

Then came the first atomic bomb. The true nature of modern war was exposed in stark reality to be promiscuous mass killing of entire populations. Sensitive consciences recoiled in horror from approval of the premeditated massacre of men, women and children. In the early days of the war, churchmen unitedly protested against the deliberate bombing of civilian populations, exclaiming with one voice that this atrocity could not possibly be reconciled with the spirit and teaching of Christ. The contrast between the way of atomic war and the way of Jesus became so transparently clear, so utterly obvious, that vast numbers of individuals moved a long step nearer the Christian pacifist position. Many a man who had reluctantly approved of and supported the waging of war against tyranny and bestiality became convinced that the wholesale slaughter of atomic war could not be justified in the name of Christ.

During the months since August 6, 1945, the conviction has deepened throughout Christendom that *a choice must be made and cannot be evaded: the way of atomic war or the way of Jesus*. One OR the other, because it is not possible to follow both ways at the same time. So plain, so inescapable is the duty of Christians to reject the way of preparedness to engage in promiscuous mass killing in atomic war; so plain, so inescapable is the duty of Christians to commit themselves unreservedly to the way of mutual aid in the solution of common problems under the reign of international law through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual confidence; so plain, so inescapable is the duty of

THE CHURCHES AND WAR

Christians to repudiate the way of the atomic bomb and to follow the way of the cross that we may expect an unprecedented growth of Christian pacifism within the next decade. Indeed, during the years immediately ahead we may expect the churches to dissociate themselves officially from the war system to an ever more extreme degree. General conferences, general assemblies, national conventions will declare in more and more resolute tones that it is sin to prepare to engage in the massacre of atomic war and that it is the will of God that Christians should run the risks and take the consequences of resolutely following the Prince of Peace.¹⁴⁸

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

An understanding of recent history is essential to success in the endeavor to prevent a third world war. Faulty diagnosis leads to inadequate remedies or to fatal prescriptions. If the future policy of the United States in relation to Germany and to Japan is based upon invalid premises the results will be disastrous. During war, propaganda is an important instrument of victory, and while the conflict continues peoples are deluged with exaggerations, distortions, half-truths, and falsehoods. Contrast is the essence of this propaganda, contrast between the wickedness of the enemy and our own righteousness, between their aggression and ruthlessness and our peaceable and just policies. Sometimes this propaganda makes a distinction between vicious leaders in enemy lands and the rank and file of citizens there; sometimes the indictment is drawn against entire populations. The consequence of all this is that most Americans now hold the conviction that the Germans and the Japanese are by nature and heritage militaristic and aggressive, whereas English-speaking peoples are naturally peaceable and law-abiding. And so they readily accept the explanation that the First World War was caused by the Kaiser and the Potsdam gang, and that the Second World War was caused by Hitler and the Japanese war lords.. The degrees of soundness and unsoundness of this conclusion must be clearly understood if a third world war is to be averted.

1. The Crisis of 1914.

Let our exploration begin with the verdict of several competent historians about the outbreak of war in 1914 and continue with a summary of the evidence upon which they base their conclusions. Professor Sidney B. Fay, formerly of Smith College and now of Harvard University, is widely recognized as one of the ablest historians in this field. In the concluding chapter of his two-volume history, Professor Fay writes:

"None of the Powers wanted a European War. Their governing rulers and ministers, with very few exceptions, all foresaw that it must be a frightful struggle, in which the political results were not absolutely certain, but in which the loss of life, suffering, and economic consequences were bound to be terrible . . . Nevertheless, a European War broke out. Why? Because in each country political and military leaders did certain things, which led to mobilizations and declarations of war, or failed to do certain things which might have prevented them. In this sense, all the European countries, in a greater or lesser degree, were responsible. One must abandon the dictum of the Versailles Treaty that Germany and her allies were solely responsible . . . It is generally recognized by the best historical scholars in all countries to be no longer tenable or defensible. They are agreed that the responsibility for the war is a divided responsibility."¹⁴⁹

Professor Fay then expresses a judgment as to the comparative responsibility of the major powers: "Austria was more responsible for the immediate origin of the war than any other Power.

Yet from her own point of view she was acting in self-defense—not against an immediate military attack, but against the corroding Greater Serbia and Yugoslav agitation which her leaders believed threatened her very existence . . . Germany did not plot a European War, did not want one, and made genuine, though too belated efforts, to avert one. She was the victim of her alliance with Austria and her own folly . . . Germany's geographical position between France and Russia, and her inferiority in number of troops, had made necessary the plan of crushing the French army quickly at first and then turning against Russia. This was only possible, in the opinion of her strategists, by marching through Belgium, as it was generally anticipated by military men that she would do in case of a European War . . .

“General mobilization of the continental armies took place in the following order: Serbia, Russia, Austria, France and Germany . . . It was the hasty Russian general mobilization, assented to on July 29 and ordered on July 30, while Germany was still trying to bring Austria to accept mediation proposals, which finally rendered the European War inevitable . . . The verdict of the Versailles Treaty that Germany and her allies were responsible for the War, in view of the evidence now available, is historically unsound . . . While it is true that Germany, no less than all the other Great Powers, did some things which contributed to produce the situation which ultimately resulted in the World War, it is altogether false to say that she deliberately planned to bring it about or was solely responsible for it. On the contrary, she worked more effectively than any other Great Power, ex-

cept England, to avert it, not only in the last days of July, 1914, but also in the years immediately preceeding."¹⁵⁰

Professor G. P. Gooch, a highly respected British historian, begins the concluding chapter of one of his books with these words: "Shortly after the termination of hostilities a high official of the Wilhelmstrasse urged his countrymen no longer to divide the belligerents into sheep and goats. 'From her own point of view Serbia was right in pursuing her national aims. Austria was no less right in seeking to retain her possessions. It was the duty of Russia to fulfill her promises to Serbia. Germany was bound to try to prevent the forcible dissolution of her only trustworthy ally. France and England were compelled to honour their treaty obligations.' Fully to comprehend the World-War and its causes we must endeavor to stand 'above the battle,' and to realize the truth of Hegel's profound aphorism, 'Tragedy is the conflict not of right with wrong, but of right with right'."

Professor Gooch then continues: "Though the conduct of each of the belligerents appeared to its enemies to indicate a double dose of original sin, it was nevertheless in every case what might have been expected . . . The conflict was in large measure the offspring of fear. The Old World had degenerated into a powder-magazine, in which the dropping of a lighted match, whether by accident or design, was almost certain to produce a gigantic conflagration . . . It is a mistake to imagine that the catastrophe took Europe unawares, for soldiers and civilians alike had been expecting and preparing for it for many years. It is also a mistake to attribute exceptional wickedness to the Gov-

ernments who, in the words of Mr. Lloyd George, stumbled and staggered into war. Blind to danger and deaf to advise as were the statesmen of the three despotic Empires, not one of them, when it came to the point, desired to set the world alight. But though they may be acquitted of the inexpressible crime of deliberately starting the avalanche, they must jointly bear the reproach of having chosen the path which led to the abyss. The outbreak of the Great War, however, is the condemnation not only of the performers who strutted for a brief hour across the stage, but above all of the international anarchy which they inherited and which they did little to abate."¹⁵¹

In response to a questionnaire which I sent out in 1930, 429 replies were received to questions about war guilt. In *The World Tomorrow*, for October of that year, I published the names of 100 American professors of history and international relations who responded to my inquiries, with the following result: *Do you believe that Germany and her allies were solely responsible for causing the World War?* Yes, 3; No, 95; In doubt, 1; No answer, 1. *Do you believe that Germany was more responsible than any other Power for causing the World War?* Yes, 32; No, 56; In Doubt, 11; No answer, 1.

By the middle thirties most American and British scholars were in substantial agreement that the First World War was not caused by German militarism and aggression. There was wide agreement with the point of view expressed in 1933 by Professor Frederick L. Schuman, then of the University of Chicago and now of Williams College: "All that happened after 1907 confirmed German fears

of 'encirclement,' for the combined military, naval, and economic resources of Great Britain, France, and Russia heavily outweighed those of Germany and Austria-Hungary . . . If Germany was not to be 'strangled' by her enemies, she must adopt a 'firm' policy and make no more concessions. Above all, she must protect her 'interests' in the Near East and strengthen Austria-Hungary in every way possible . . . In view of these developments, the German Government felt that it had no alternative in the crisis of 1914 to supporting Austria-Hungary, in her determination to chastise Serbia . . . If Germany refused to support Austria-Hungary, the Triple Alliance would be weakened and Berlin would remain isolated within a circle of enemies. By the secret terms of the Franco-Russian alliance, mobilization was the signal for war. On July 31 the German Government dispatched a twelve-hour ultimatum to St. Petersburg, demanding the suspension of all Russian war measures. No reply was received . . . All German patriots rallied to the sacred cause of the fatherland, certain that Germany had been attacked by scheming enemies and that their only course was to hack their way to victory through encircling foes."¹⁵²

In his memoirs, Lloyd George expressed his convictions about the crisis of 1914: "No sovereign or leading statesman in any of the belligerent countries sought or desired war—certainly not a European war . . . What about Germany? I am convinced after a careful perusal of all the documents available on all sides that the Kaiser never had the remotest idea that he was plunging—or being plunged—into a European war . . . He was not anticipating a costly war but a cheap diplo-

matic triumph . . . His Chancellor was opposed to war. His Foreign Minister left Berlin on a honeymoon. The Chief of his Staff, von Moltke, was taking a cure at one of the German watering-places . . . He had not accumulated sufficient stores of food or raw materials to face the blockade of the British Fleet.”¹⁵³

The crisis of 1914 had been preceded by many other international crises and was the product of basic underlying factors which may be summarized under the familiar headings: nationalism, imperialism, militarism, alliances and the balance of power, ultimatums and the military time-table. In this complex arrangement of human affairs will be found the dynamics of the First World War.

2. *Nationalism.*

Nationalism is one of the mightiest forces in the modern world. Highly unifying and deeply divisive, wonderfully creative and terribly destructive, nationalism powerfully influences the daily life of peoples all over the earth. So complex is nationalism that no single element accounts for its potency. Language is important, but in Switzerland with its intense nationalism, German, Italian and French are official languages, and in Soviet Russia scores of tongues and dialects are spoken. The English language is common to the peoples of the British Isles, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, The United States and other lands. Chile and Argentina and Uruguay have no separate languages but their citizens speak Spanish and various Indian dialects, while the Brazilians speak Portuguese. Many Canadians of Quebec speak French, but the Basques and Bretons of

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

France have their own tongues. English and Spanish are both official in New Mexico. In New York City, Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, tens of thousands of Americans regularly speak German, Russian, Polish, Yiddish, Italian, Greek. Race is an important element in nationalism, but in most nations substantial numbers of two or more races are found. Religion also is significant, but Protestant, Catholic, Jew, agnostic, atheist, may be equally responsive to American nationalism, whereas in Mother India Hindu, Mohammedan, Sikh and Christian all desire national independence. Culture is important, but in every land there are striking contrasts between highly educated individuals and illiterates, between rich and poor, between urban and city dwellers.

Nationalism is a feeling, a sentiment, a state of of mind, a relationship, an attachment, a loyalty, a "religion." This devotion to country, this consciousness of kind, this awareness of difference from other peoples, provide the foundations upon which the great doctrines of nationalism are erected: the doctrine of national interest, the doctrine of national sovereignty, the doctrine of national patriotism.

Long before the outbreak of the First World War, an American Admiral, Alfred T. Mahan, wrote: "Self-interest is not only a legitimate, but a fundamental cause of national policy; one which needs no cloak of hypocrisy . . . it is vain to expect governments to act continuously on any other ground than national interest. They have no right to do so, being agents and not principals."¹⁵⁴ In another place, Admiral Mahan said: "Governments are corporations, and corporations have no

souls . . . must put first the interests of their own wards . . . their own people." This basic idea of national interest was supreme in the formation of foreign policy for every belligerent power. What is best for us? what will increase our prosperity? what will insure our safety? what will magnify our power? what will enhance our prestige?—these were the obsessions of statesmen everywhere.

The doctrine of national sovereignty provided the means of determining national interest. Every nation must decide its own policies and choose its own courses of action. The national government alone is competent to determine policies concerning tariffs and subsidies, immigration, the treatment of minorities and colonial peoples, the size of its armed forces, armed interventions in other lands, and declarations of war. The basic assumption was that national interests must be safeguarded and promoted by any means considered effective or necessary by national governments. Germany alone could decide what was necessary for the protection of Germany's interests; France must not permit any outside power to interfere with France's right to determine her own policies. The idea of a super-state with power to limit national sovereignty was abhorrent to every belligerent government. The result was international anarchy. Every nation was a law unto itself. Much of what was called international law was merely the formal recognition of the practices of the great powers. Diplomacy operated normally on the basis that the end justifies the means. Secrecy was carried to such lengths that not only were peoples generally left in the dark, but sometimes even parliaments were not informed of secret provisions

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

of treaties. When diplomacy failed in a serious crisis, the next step was resort to war. It was Theodore Roosevelt who wrote in those pre-war years: ". . . we feel that no national life is worth having if the nation is not willing, when the need shall arise, to stake everything on the supreme arbitrament of war and to pour out its blood, its treasure, and tears like water rather than submit to the loss of honor or renown."¹⁵⁵ When the Hague Conference in 1899 recommended that parties unable to settle controversies by diplomacy should submit them to inquiry by an impartial commission, the proposal covered only matters "involving neither honor nor vital interest." Thus the peoples of Europe in the summer of 1914 were living in a condition of anarchy among the nations.

National patriotism furnished the popular support required for the exercise of national sovereignty in serving national interests. Everywhere it was assumed that a citizen must loyally support his own government in all controversies with other governments, and that he must wage war when commanded to do so by his government in the defense of national interests and in upholding national honor. The classic expression of this idea comes from Stephen Decatur, an American naval officer who was himself killed in a duel in 1820: "Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong." On the occasion of swearing in the recruits at Potsdam on November 23, 1891, the Kaiser said: "More and more unbelief and discontent raise their heads in the Fatherland, and it may come to pass that you will have to shoot down or stab your own relatives and brothers. Then seal

your loyalty with your hearts blood."¹⁵⁶ Treitschke pointed out that "it was Machiavelli who first laid down that maxim that when the state's salvation is at stake there must be no enquiry into the purity of the means employed; only let the State be secured and no one will condemn them . . . No State can pledge its future to another. It knows no arbiter and draws up all its treaties with this implied reservation . . . Moreover, every sovereign State has the undoubted right to declare war at its pleasure, and is consequently entitled to repudiate its treaties."¹⁵⁷ It was the British statesman, Lord Hugh Cecil, who wrote: "A soldier in sacrificing his individuality to the State has become the docile instrument of devilish work . . . The service he renders to the State is Christian; the sacrifices he makes for it are holy; but the work he does at its bidding is hellish . . . Yet the soldiers have no responsibility or guilt for what is done. They are instruments in the hands of the State, and the terrible and unnatural spectacle of brave and kindly men inflicting unspeakable suffering on others arises . . . out of the absorption of the individual in the State. This absorption is essential to war . . . But conscience does not operate and rightly does not operate."¹⁵⁸

Patriotic loyalty was fed upon pride and fear. Contrast was the essence of nationalist propaganda, contrast between the characteristics and achievements of one's own land and those of foreigners. The Kaiser once thrilled his subjects with the assurance: "The German people will be granite blocks on which the good God may build and complete His work of Kultur in the world. Then will be fulfilled the word of the poet who said that

the world will one day be healed by the German character . . . We are the salt of the earth. God has created us to civilize the world."¹⁵⁹ Lord Curzon dedicated his book, *Problems of the Far East*, to "those who believe that the British Empire is, under Providence, the greatest instrument for good that the world has ever seen." Cecil Rhodes, the empire builder, recorded this conviction: "I contend that we are the first race in the world, and the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race."¹⁶⁰ Countless illustrations of this national boasting could easily be assembled from the utterances and writings of statesmen and publicists in all the belligerent countries.

Patriotic zeal was further stimulated by contrasting the glories of one's own land with the iniquities of other peoples. For decades prior to the outbreak of war in 1914 a mighty stream of invectives poured across the boundary lines of Europe. Suspicion and fear and hatred were instilled into children and adults through the school and the press and the platform. One of the French textbooks which taught hatred of Germany went through 224 editions.¹⁶¹ Professor Adolph Wagner, member of the Prussian House of Lords, once cried out: "The whole history of France since Caesar is a long chronicle of war and of conquest. The glory of which you are proudest is your military glory. Look what a fuss you make about Napoleon . . . You are battle-lovers. We Germans are not so. The military spirit descended on us too late."¹⁶² The French professor, Gustave Le Bon, wrote: "The servile docility of the Germans made Frederick the Great exclaim that he was tired of governing slaves . . . Among the characteristics which

are most prevalent in the German mentality may be mentioned brutality, lack of good breeding, and an entire absence of the chivalrous spirit . . . Insincerity is one of the commonest German defects."¹⁶³

Thus a highly provocative attitude was created by the pictures in the minds of patriots. The vision of one's own land was distorted by exaggerating its virtues and minimizing its vices, whereas the image of other peoples was distorted by exaggerating the weaknesses and faults of neighbors across the border and by minimizing their good qualities. The consequent sensitivity and fear made citizens of all belligerent countries easy prey for national propagandists. From a vantage point of historical perspective, it was easy to foresee the coming of war. In a society organized in terms of national interest, national sovereignty, and national patriotism, the outbreak of war is merely the natural culmination of clashing interests and conflicting emotions.

3. Imperialism.

Imperialism is control, economic and political control of a people by an alien power. The rise of industrialism and the intensification of nationalism provided the dynamic of the new imperialism. Desire for gain, craving for prestige, fear of defeat in the struggle for power, and the sense of duty combined to drive governments into a scramble for new possessions. Within a period of thirty years, from about 1880 to 1910, the imperialist nations partitioned the world among themselves. Their respective shares of the spoils of conquest in Africa are revealed in the following tables:¹⁶⁴

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

	Total Area in Square Miles
British Africa	3,701,411
French Africa	4,086,950
German Africa	910,150
Belgian Africa	900,000
Portuguese Africa	787,500
Italian Africa	600,000
Spanish Africa	79,800
Independent States	393,000
	<hr/> 11,458,811

Mr. Leonard Woolf, a British authority on imperialism, has thus summarized the blending of greed and idealism in the partitioning of a continent: "The European went into Africa about forty years ago desiring to exploit it and its inhabitants for his own economic advantage and he rapidly acquired the belief that the power of his State should be used in Africa to promote his own economic interests. Once this belief was accepted, it destroyed the idea of individual moral responsibility. The State, enthroned in its impersonality and a glamour of patriotism, can always make a wilderness and call it peace, or make a conquest and call it civilization. The right of Europe to civilize became synonymous with the right of Europe to rob or to exploit the uncivilized. The power of each European State was applied ruthlessly in Africa. In bitter competition with one another, they partitioned territory which belonged to none of them. By fraud or by force the native chiefs and rulers were swindled or robbed of their dominions. Any resistance by the inhabitants to the encroachments either of individual Europeans or of European States was treated as 'rebellion,' and followed by massacres known as wars or punitive expeditions. In this process tribe was used against tribe and race against race, and wherever any

IMPERIALISM

native administration existed it was destroyed. This work was accomplished by men who were not more rapacious or evil than the ordinary man; it was accomplished by men often of ideals and great devotion, but who accepted a political dogma, namely, that their actions were justified by the right and duty of the European State to use its power in Africa for the economic interests of its European subjects . . . The dogma of economic imperialism prevailed with the aid of modern rifle and gun. The slaughter of the most warlike Africans encouraged the survivors to submit, and peace descended upon the greater part of Africa. The first stage of economic imperialism was accomplished, and the European looked round and openly proclaimed that the work he had done was good."¹⁶⁵

Conquest was not limited to the continent of Africa, vast areas in Asia and the islands of the seas were seized and incorporated into the respective empires. Comparative figures for 1914 were as follows: ¹⁶⁶

EXTENT OF COLONIAL EMPIRES

Countries	—Square Miles—		Percentage of World's Total Colonial Area	Ratio: Mother Country to Colonies
	Mother Country	Possessions		
United Kingdom	121,633	12,687,361	59.38	1.0 to 104.3
France	212,659	4,089,897	19.14	1.0 to 19.2
Germany	208,780	1,134,193	5.31	1.0 to 5.4
Portugal	35,488	804,552	3.77	1.0 to 22.6
Belgium	11,373	909,600	4.25	1.0 to 80.0
Netherlands	12,582	781,592	3.66	1.0 to 62.1
Italy	110,632	591,200	2.77	1.0 to 5.3
Spain	191,988	134,760	.63	1.4 to 1.0
United States	3,624,122	119,333	.56	30.4 to 1.0
Japan	148,756	113,482	.53	1.3 to 1.0
Total	4,678,013	21,365,970	100.00	1.0 to 4.6

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

POPULATIONS CONTROLLED

Countries	Mother Country	Possessions	Percentage of World's Total Colonial Population	Ratio: Mother Country to Colonies
United Kingdom	46,406,000	393,327,000	69.96	1.0 to 8.5
France	41,476,000	56,092,000	9.98	1.0 to 1.4
Germany	64,926,000	12,287,000	2.19	5.3 to 1.0
Portugal	5,958,000	8,735,000	1.55	1.0 to 1.5
Belgium	7,642,000	7,000,000	1.25	1.1 to 1.0
Netherlands	6,779,000	48,102,000	8.56	1.0 to 7.1
Italy	36,740,000	1,750,000	.33	21.1 to 1.0
Spain	20,720,000	1,305,000	.24	15.9 to 1.0
United States	105,709,000	11,719,000	2.08	9.0 to 1.0
Japan	55,961,000	21,844,000	3.88	2.6 to 1.0
Total	392,317,000	562,161,000	100.00	1.0 to 1.4

Professor William L. Langer, of Harvard University, closes a monumental two-volume study of imperialism during the period 1890 to 1902, with these illuminating words: "One cannot study this period without marveling at the exuberance and optimism which went hand in hand with recklessness and confidence in the conduct of foreign affairs. It was taken for granted that the world was marked out by Providence for exploitation by the European white man and that the principle of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost was natural law. In the writings of the statesmen and in the writings of journalists there is very little trace of deeper understanding. The rise of Japan, the Adua disaster, the Boxer rising, none of these epoch-making events really opened the eyes of Europe. Even Lord Salisbury could see in the world nothing but a few virile nations and a large number of dying nations. The basic problem of international relations was who should cut up the victims."¹⁶⁷

Professor Gilbert Murray, one of the most eminent British scholars in this generation, has elo-

quently phrased the relationship between national pride and imperialism: "In every nation of Europe from England and France to Russia and Turkey, in almost every nation in the world from the Americas to the Chinese and the Finns, the same whisper from below the threshold sounds incessantly in men's ears. 'We are the pick and the flower of nations; the only nation that is really generous and brave and just. We are above all things qualified for governing others; we know how to keep them exactly in their place without weakness and without cruelty . . . The excellence of our rule abroad is proved in black and white by the books of our explorers, our missionaries, our administrators and our soldiers, who all agree that our yoke is a pure blessing to those who bear it'." ¹⁶⁸

Many British authorities agree with the judgment of one of their own publicists, Wilfred Scawen Blunt, who wrote in his diary: "England led the way in the white scramble for Africa . . . England was the chief sinner among the white Empires in their dealings with the weak nations of the African world . . . Germany's plunder of the weak has been small in act compared to ours, or even to that of France, during the past half century . . . The only difference between Berlin morality and ours in Downing Street had been that we had been careful to preserve our outward attitude of forbearance and respect for moral right, while Berlin had been shameless in its anti-human logic. Also that as an Empire we were already sated like a lion surrounded with the carcasses of its prey, while Germany was alert and hungry." ¹⁶⁹

4. *Militarism.*

National armaments provided the power for the exercise of national sovereignty in the pursuit of national interests. Because armies and navies are expensive, it was necessary for governments to convince peoples that money spent in preparation for war was a good investment and provided cheap insurance against national disaster. Therefore, continuous efforts were put forth to militarize the minds of citizens in the various belligerent lands. To the degree that patriots acquired the military mind they were willing to carry the burdens of armed preparedness.

The philosophy of militarism is a blend of the ideas that war is inevitable, war is necessary, war is beneficial, armed preparedness is the best guarantee of peace, the end justifies the means, military necessity, the futility of treaties, war may be Christian. It would be easy to fill several big volumes with utterances and writings from many lands illustrating these ideas. The loudest sword rattling was done by the old Prussian military leaders. Field Marshal Count Von Moltke, in his famous letter to Professor Bluntschli in 1880, said: "Perpetual peace is a dream, and it is not even a beautiful dream. War is an element in the order of the world ordained by God. In it the noblest virtues of mankind are developed; courage and the abnegation of self, faithfulness to duty, and the spirit of sacrifice; the soldier gives his life. Without war the world would stagnate, and lose itself in materialism."¹⁷⁰ General von Bernhardt wrote: "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which cannot be dispensed with, since

without it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization . . . War, from this standpoint, will be regarded as a moral necessity . . . Reflection thus shows not only that war is an unqualified necessity, but that it is justifiable from every point of view."¹⁷¹ Professor Baron Karl von Stengel, a jurist who was one of Germany's delegates at the first Hague Conference, wrote: "War has more often facilitated than hindered progress . . . Storm purifies the air and destroys the frail trees, leaving the sturdy oaks standing. War is the test of a nation's political, physical, and intellectual worth . . . It is better to spend money on armaments and battleships than on luxury, motormanias, and other sensual living."¹⁷² An official organ of young Germany, *Jung Deutschland*, in October, 1913, exclaimed: "War is the noblest and holiest expression of human activity . . . Still and deep in the German heart must live the joy of battle and the longing for it. Let us ridicule to the utmost the old women in breeches who fear war and deplore it as cruel and revolting. No, war is beautiful."¹⁷³

In every belligerent land war was acclaimed. Renan the Frenchman exclaimed: "War is in a way one of the conditions of progress, the cut of the whip which prevents a country from going to sleep, forcing satisfied mediocrity itself to leave its apathy."¹⁷⁴ Lord Wolseley, commander-in-chief of the British forces, cried out: "All other pleasures pale before the intense, the maddening delight of leading men into the midst of an enemy, or to the assault of some well-defended place. That rapturous enjoyment takes man out of himself to

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

the forgetfulness of all earthly consideration . . . A sound healthy, military spirit gives strength to a people. It is the guardian of the honour and interests of a nation, the safeguard of its freedom and liberties, the purifier of its civilization, its defence against enemies from without, and degeneracy from within."¹⁷⁵ In a famous address at Manchester in 1912, Lord Roberts, a former Commander-in-Chief of the British Army, warned his hearers that "Germany strikes when Germany's hour has struck . . . And, gentlemen, it is an excellent policy. It is, or should be, the policy of every nation prepared to play a great part in history . . . For how was this Empire of Britain founded? War founded this Empire—war and conquest! When we, therefore, masters by war of one-third of the habitable globe, when *we* propose to Germany to disarm, to curtail her navy or diminish her army, Germany naturally refuses; and, pointing, not without justice, to the road by which England, sword in hand, has climbed to her unmatched eminence, declares openly, or in the veiled language of diplomacy, that by the same path, if by no other, Germany is determined also to ascend! Who amongst us, knowing the past of this nation, and the past of all nations and cities that have ever added the lustre of their name to human annals, can accuse Germany or regard the utterance of one of her greatest chancellors a year and a half ago, or of General Bernhardt three months ago, with any feelings except those of respect?"¹⁷⁶

The result of all this was a race of armaments. For forty years prior to the outbreak of war in 1914 the nations of Europe spent on armaments an average of a billion dollars per year. Comparative

MILITARISM

expenditures were as follows:¹⁷⁷

TOTAL COST OF EUROPEAN ARMAMENTS FROM 1873 TO 1913 (In dollars — 000,000 omitted)

Nation	Total for Armaments	Army Expenses	Navy Expenses
France	\$8,568	\$6,105	\$2,463 (c)
Great Britain (b)	8,401	4,373	4,028
Russia (a)	7,581	6,150	1,431
Germany	7,434	5,782	1,652
Italy	3,010	2,163	847
Austria-Hungary	2,774	2,478	296
Total—41 years	\$37,768	\$27,051	\$10,717

(a) Deducting the cost of the war with Japan, \$1,333 million.

(b) Deducting the cost of the Boer War, \$1,368 million.

(c) "Marine and Colonies." Figures not segregated, but official statement from which they are taken includes them as part of "the military expenses of our country."

It will be observed that the rank of expenditures of the various countries is as follows:—France, first in total, second in army, second in navy; United Kingdom, second in total, fourth in army, first in navy; Russia, third in total, first in army, fourth in navy; Germany, fourth in total, third in army, third in navy; Italy, fifth in total, sixth in army, fifth in navy; Austria-Hungary, sixth in total, fifth in army, sixth in navy.

The rank in total expenditures for armaments during the fourteen years immediately preceding the World War was as follows:¹⁷⁸

	Millions of pounds sterling
1. Great Britain	889.6*
2. Russia	810.2
3. Germany	765.9
4. France	660.4

* Not including 178 millions of extraordinary expenses because of the Boer War. The above figures include an average of 28 millions for 1900-1903.

The relative speed at which the Great Powers of

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Europe were expanding their navies is indicated in the following table:

NEW NAVAL CONSTRUCTION—1909 TO 1914¹⁷⁹

	Great Britain	France	Russia	Germany
1909	£11,076,551	4,517,766	1,758,487	10,177,962
1910	14,755,289	2,977,682	1,424,013	11,392,856
1911	15,148,171	5,876,659	3,216,396	11,710,859
1912	16,132,558	7,114,876	6,897,580	11,491,187
1913	16,883,875	8,893,064	12,082,516	11,010,883
1914	18,676,080	11,772,862	13,098,613	10,316,264

Inasmuch as the naval race between Great Britain and Germany was a primary cause of international friction, the following table of *new fighting ships launched* each year from 1900 onward is of especial significance:¹⁸⁰

Year	Great Britain			Germany		
	No. of Ships	Tonnage	Horse-power	No. of Ships	Tonnage	Horse-power
1900	17	31,375	136,250	15	44,828	121,690
1901	22	204,822	366,550	13	58,501	115,050
1902	23	97,268	198,540	15	33,356	114,322
1903	38	152,607	338,150	14	59,459	141,260
1904	35	128,988	389,500	11	44,228	121,210
1905	27	97,038	211,700	11	38,002	157,400
1906	27	86,253	139,406	16	63,526	183,750
1907	35	134,254	379,100	17	15,530	179,000
1908	31	51,505	164,200	18	99,703	241,250
1909	36	99,348	396,200	24	107,683	364,000
1910	42	132,764	597,475	19	54,274	267,680
1911	44	226,636	741,800	25	124,200	481,100
1912	30	163,821	591,900	23	91,891	356,500
1913	42	185,294	1,096,200	19	132,264	327,750
Totals	449	1,791,973	5,746,971	240	967,445	3,171,962

The comparative size of the various armies in 1895 and 1914 was as follows:¹⁸¹

	1914	1895	Population 1914
Russia	1,300,000	910,000	174,000,000
France	846,000	572,000	40,000,000

ALLIANCES AND THE BALANCE OF POWER

Germany	812,000	585,000	68,000,000
Austria-Hungary	424,000	349,000	52,000,000
Italy	318,000	238,000	36,000,000
Great Britain	250,000	369,000	46,000,000
Japan	250,000	54,000,000
United States	105,000	99,000,000

5. Alliances and the Balance of Power

The pursuit of national interests through the exercise of national sovereignty undergirded by national patriotism failed to provide security. Fear gripped the peoples of all belligerent countries and statesmen were haunted by the sense of insecurity. Dependable allies came to be regarded as essential to national safety. The result was that the six major powers of Europe settled down in two rival camps: the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy; and the Triple Entente of France, Russia, and Great Britain.

Thereafter, the race of armaments was a struggle for supremacy between contending alliances. The comparative expenditures on armaments during the years from 1900 to 1913 inclusive, by the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente were as follows: ¹⁸²

	(Millions of Pounds Sterling)		
	Army	Navy	Total
Germany	551.5	214.4	765.9
Austria-Hungary	282.5	46.2	328.7
Italy	193.7	95.0	288.7
Total of Triple Alliance.....	1,027.7	355.6	1,383.3
Russia	636.8	173.4	810.2
France	464.0	196.4	660.4
Great Britain	390.1*	499.5	889.6
Total of Triple Entente.....	1,490.9	869.3	2,360.2

(* Not including 178 millions, extraordinary expenditures in the South African War. The above figures include an average of 28 millions for 1900-1903.)

THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

It was common knowledge, however, that Italy could not be depended upon to support Germany and Austria-Hungary in a general war and that in all probability she would support the Triple Entente, as eventually proved to be the case. If, therefore, we transfer Italy's expenditures to the side of the Triple Entente we get the following summary:

Germany and Austria.....	1094 million pounds
Triple Entente plus Italy.....	2648 million pounds

The relative strength of the armies of the two combinations in 1914 was as follows: ¹⁸³

Germany	812,000	Russia	1,300,000
Austria-Hungary	424,000	France	846,000
Italy	318,000	Great Britain.....	250,000
<hr/>		<hr/>	
Total of Triple Alliance	1,554,000	Total of Triple Entente	2,396,000

With Italy's figures transferred, the total stands:

Germany and Austria.....	1,236,000
Triple Entente plus Italy.....	2,704,000

The comparative naval strength of the rival groups in 1914 was as follows: ¹⁸⁴

	Capital Ships	Armoured Cruisers	Light Cruisers	Torpedo-Boats and Gunboats	Destroyers	Submarines
Germany	48	9	49	54	144	36
Austria-Hungary	20	2	13	84	18	11
Italy	20	9	13	109	48	26
<hr/>						
Total of Triple Alliance	88	20	75	247	210	73
Great Britain	82	51	92	122	248	97
France	34	20	11	168	83	102
Russia	22	6	16	35	140	55
<hr/>						
Total of Triple Entente	138	77	119	325	471	254

Under a system of alliance and counter-alliance, maintenance of the balance of power was considered absolutely imperative. Statesmen were therefore constantly endeavoring to tip the balance in their own favor or to prevent it from being turned against them. Thus the clash of national interests expressed itself in a struggle for power. The rivalry between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente came to dominate the diplomatic relations of all the belligerent countries. Indeed Professor Fay says bluntly: "The greatest single underlying cause of the War was the system of secret alliances which developed after the Franco-Prussian War."¹⁸⁵ At the peak of the crisis in 1914 Herr Zimmermann exclaimed: "It all came from this damned system of alliances which was the curse of modern times."

6. *Ultimatums and the Military Time-Table.*

Concerning the time factor in a serious crisis, Philip Kerr, wartime private secretary to Lloyd George and later, as Lord Lothian, British Ambassador in Washington, makes this penetrating observation: "What was it that precipitated the Great War? . . . *It was the military time-table.* No sooner did Austria-Hungary begin to mobilize in support of her ultimatum to Serbia than the Russian General Staff felt bound to do the same, in order not to be caught at a disadvantage if the struggle spread. And no sooner did Russia begin to mobilize than Germany felt that she must do so also, for the plans of the German General Staff in the event of a European war were based upon the capacity of the German army to mobilize a few days faster than the French army, and to crush it

before the Russians could take the field. Hence the frantic telegrams of the Kaiser to the Czar, imploring and commanding him to countermand the mobilization, once he realized, when it was too late, where the policy of the ultimatum was hurrying with breakneck speed. Whether the Kaiser or any other responsible man ever deliberately pressed the button to start a general European war, I don't know. Personally, I doubt it. It was the terrible military time-table, the inevitable outcome of Prussian militarism and the division of Europe into a number of rival and separate national states, which made it almost impossible to stop the war once the first fatal step of mobilization had been taken. The Czar could not countermand mobilization unless Austria-Hungary countermanded it. And neither Berlin nor Vienna would countermand, after the fatal ultimatum to Serbia, because to do so would have meant an abject humiliation for the Central Powers far worse than that of Agadir."¹⁸⁶

For all these reasons Professor Fay is justified in saying: "It was the hasty Russian general mobilization . . . which finally rendered the European War inevitable." Professor Gooch is equally warranted in saying: "The conflict was in large measure the offspring of fear. The Old World had degenerated into a powder-magazine, in which the dropping of a lighted match, whether by accident or design, was almost certain to produce a gigantic conflagration."

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR II

The world war which broke out in 1914 was interrupted in 1918 by an embittered truce which was terminated in 1939 by the resumption of armed action which continues to this day, in the form of armies of occupation and continued preparations for further combat. Thus we are now in the thirty-second year of world wars. Germans and Russians and Frenchmen born since 1910 have never known the normal experiences of peacetime. The German march into Poland did not in reality begin a new war. The Nazi Fuehrer merely fanned smoldering embers into a furious fire. This fact does not reduce the degree of Hitler's guilt, but it does help us to understand the nature of his responsibility.

1. The Policy of France.

The origins of World War II are to be found in the embittered truce which officially ended the First World War. Therefore, a study of the policy of France is required, not because French policy was always sharply in contrast to British and American policies, but because it was more extreme and more immovable.

Let us begin with the Versailles Conference, where M. Georges Clemenceau its President played such a decisive role. Every move Clemenceau made was determined by two guiding principles: Germany must be weakened, France must be strengthened. He loved France with a passion rarely equaled among patriots. During the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 he abandoned the prac-

tice of medicine and entered politics as the radical young Mayor of Montmartre. From that hour until he presided at Versailles he had devoted fifty years to fighting for France. Well had he earned the right to be known as "The Tiger." He was thus described by Colonel House: "His face was a masque, but behind it burned unquenchable fires—fires kindled by the Germans in 1870 and to which they added fuel in 1914-1918 . . . I never caught him seeking self-advantage; it was France—always his beloved France."¹⁸⁷ Mr. Lloyd George said this about Clemenceau: "He was in every fibre of his being a Frenchman. He had no real interest in humanity as a whole. His sole concern was for France . . . His hatred of Germany had a concentrated ferocity which I had never seen before . . . He was essentially an angry man . . . this volcano of rumbling and surging hatreds . . . By conviction and temperament he was an inexorable cynic. He had no belief in the ultimate victory of right . . . Clemenceau's one aim was to keep Germany down feeble and fettered."¹⁸⁸

Mr. Herbert Hoover has written this interpretation of Clemenceau: "His soul contained to his dying day all the bitterness of the sufferings of the French people. The widows, orphans, and ruined homes of France were the lenses he looked through. To him the turn of Germany to democracy was a fraud; the only way to deal with them was to make them impotent forever. Had he been the sole victor in the war he would have taken Carthage as the only adequate historic precedent for action."¹⁸⁹

At the forefront of Clemenceau's policy was the total and permanent disarmament of Germany.

The treaty when signed provided that the German army was to be limited to 100,000 men and be denied all tanks, heavy artillery, and airplanes. The German navy was restricted to six battleships of not more than 10,000 tons, six light cruisers, twelve destroyers, and no submarines. Both sides of the Rhine were demilitarized. The left bank and the bridge-heads were subject to Allied military occupation for fifteen years. Foch and Poincare and Clemenceau fought bitterly for the permanent detachment of the left bank from Germany. Clemenceau yielded because, failing to gain the approval of Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson, he believed it too perilous for France to proceed alone, and because he expected the occupation to be prolonged far beyond the fifteen years. This decision caused him later to lose the French Presidency and to be looked upon throughout France as the man who "lost the peace."

Germany was deprived by the treaty of substantial and valuable territories: all overseas colonies, Alsace-Lorraine, the Saar Valley, Eupen and Malmedy, the Polish corridor, part of Upper Silesia, and a portion of Schleswig. She lost one-fourth of her coal, and three-fourths of her iron. Germany was the victim of various economic agreements directed against her. The French Finance Minister Klotz went so far as to say: "The devastated countries would never agree to raw materials being supplied to Germany, where the factories were still intact, until their own industries had been reestablished."¹⁹⁰ German investments and property abroad were seized. Various French statesmen sought vigorously to break up Germany into independent provinces. Clemenceau once exclaimed:

THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR II

"The more separate and independent republics were established in Germany, the better he would be pleased." The treaty prohibited union between Germany and Austria-Hungary. Moreover, Germany was for several years denied membership in the League of Nations.

A Reparations Commission was provided for in the treaty to fix Germany's financial obligations to indemnify the Allies for civilian damages, pensions, and the Belgian war debt. This sum was fixed at 132 billion gold marks, about 31 billion dollars. Even after the Young Plan had supplanted the Dawes revision, Germany was bound to make heavy annual payments until the year 1988. This meant that Germans born in 1914 would be 74 years of age when the last scheduled payment was made. At the Lausanne Conference in 1932 the reparation clauses of the treaty were abolished and German reparations were canceled. Germany agreed instead to pay three billion gold marks (about \$750,000,000) into a European reconstruction fund.

Article 231 of the treaty which the Germans were compelled to sign, was used as a justification of the severity of its terms by saddling upon Germany responsibility for causing the war. Mr. Lloyd George expressed the common conviction when he said: "For the Allies, German responsibility is decisive; it is the foundation on which the structure of the Treaty of Paris has been reared. If recognition of this fact be refused as invalid, the Treaty itself falls." Clemenceau on countless occasions expressed this conviction. "For the catastrophe of 1914 the Germans are responsible. Only a professional liar would deny this." President

PROPHECIES OF DISASTER

Wilson in his Columbus address said that the peace treaty "seeks to punish one of the greatest wrongs ever done in history, the wrong which Germany sought to do to the world and to civilization . . . The terms of the treaty are severe, but they are not unjust." The terms would have been much more severe if Clemenceau and other French statesmen had been able to accomplish their full purpose of destroying utterly the power of Germany ever to menace France again.

2. Prophecies of Disaster.

General Smuts at the end of the Versailles Conference expressed apprehension to President Wilson that "this Peace may well become an even greater disaster to the world than the war was." At four o'clock in the morning of May 7, 1919, Herbert Hoover began to read an advance copy of the treaty. He writes: "I was greatly disturbed. In it, hate and revenge ran through the political and economic passages . . . It seemed to me the economic consequences alone would pull down all Europe . . . I arose and went for a walk in the deserted streets of early daylight. In a few blocks I met General Smuts. If ever there was something telepathic, it was in that meeting, for it flashed on both our minds why the other was walking about at that time of day."¹⁹¹

During the conference, Lloyd George prepared a memorandum in which he wrote: "History has proved that a peace which has been hailed by a victorious nation as a triumph of diplomatic skill and statesmanship, even of moderation, in the long run has proved itself to be shortsighted and charged with danger to the victor . . . You may

strip Germany of her colonies, reduce her armaments to a mere police force and her navy to that of a fifth rate power; all the same in the end if she feels that she has been unjustly treated in the peace of 1919 she will find means of exacting retribution from her conquerors . . . Injustice, arrogance, displayed in the hour of triumph will never be forgotten or forgiven."¹⁹²

Mr. John Maynard Keynes, a member of the British delegation, resigned, went home, and wrote that prophetic volume, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*. Mr. Harold Nicolson, another member of the British staff at Versailles, wrote: "The historian, with every justification, will come to the conclusion that we were very stupid men. I think we were." Mr. Georg Brandes, the Scandinavian scholar, said during the conference: "The Allies are drunk with victory and are too bent upon inflicting punishments to make a just and durable peace."

The ink of the treaty was hardly dry when a manifesto was signed by a group of British statesmen and historians, in which they declared: " . . . The general purpose underlying every section of the Treaty is obvious. It is to reduce the new democratic Germany to the position of a vassal state, to render her commercial recovery impossible; to drive her out of international life; to crush the spirit of her people . . . The prospects for the German people under the Treaty is that of a nation of serfs working for their conquerors in arms."¹⁹³ Mr. J. L. Garvin, eminent British editor, and later Editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, wrote: "These terms . . . revolve in the vicious virulence of the old diplomacy, they re-

PROPHECIES OF DISASTER

peat the fatal precedents which have always led back to war and make the end of one struggle the direct cause of another. There will be quarrels, conspiracies, agitations, assassinations, revolutions, and collapse."¹⁹⁴

By 1923 Lloyd George was writing: "The world has not learned one single syllable . . . The horror of the Great War seems to have unhinged the European mind. Nations do not think normally. The blood pressure is still very high . . . A peace wrung by triumphant force out of helplessness is never a good peace."¹⁹⁵ In that year Lord Robert Cecil wrote in great alarm: "As I saw the European situation the causes which had produced the war in 1914 were bound to resume their sway. Again would grow up the fears and jealousies, the greed and ambition which had brought about that catastrophe. For the time being the recollection of the war was too vivid and the exhaustion of the nations was too great for it to be possible that a major war should break out. But we had not much time. I put it at about ten years."

In that same year of 1923 I returned from my fourth period of study and observation in Europe and published a pamphlet entitled *France and the Peace of Europe*. Even for a young and inexperienced student of world affairs it was possible to predict: "Sooner or later French military domination of Europe is sure to be challenged by a combination of other powers . . . France thinks she is achieving security. But France is blind . . . The more France depends upon military power and the more vigorously she seeks to crush her enemies, the more unstable becomes her own security,

and the more certain becomes her ultimate downfall."

In 1924 Winston Churchill published a notable article in which he said: "... the causes of war have been in no way removed; indeed they are in some respects aggravated by the so-called Peace Treaty and the reactions following therefrom . . . From one end of Germany to the other an intense hatred of France unites the whole population. This passion is fanned continuously by the action of the French government. The enormous contingents of German youth growing to military manhood year by year are inspired by the fiercest sentiments, and the soul of Germany smolders with dreams of a war of liberation or revenge."¹⁹⁶ By 1935 Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin was exclaiming: "I feel that I am living in a mad-house." In 1939 when Quo Tai Chi, Chinese Ambassador in London, was asked to comment upon the outbreak of war, he observed: "The sky is black with chickens coming home to roost."

3. The Economic Factors.

Economic frustration and misery were primary factors in the collapse of the German Republic, the rise of Nazism and the precipitation of war. Five stages must be differentiated: the war period, the years 1919-1923, the years 1924-1928, the years 1929-1932, and the years 1933-1939. War-time economic measures were followed by postwar collapse and anguish; then a time of rising prosperity, terminated by economic depression; then the Nazi feverish boom of preparation for war.

Throughout the war Germany fought against

overwhelming odds. Colossal expenditures year after year finally brought the German government to near-bankruptcy and the German people to economic ruin. The Armistice was followed by prolonged continuation of the economic blockade of Germany. Concerning this phase Herbert Hoover wrote: "Another futile and even wicked thrust of Allied militarism and punishment was continuing the food blockade against Germany after the Armistice on November 11, 1918. The provisions of the Armistice promised food, but no food was allowed in until nearly five months later, in the latter part of March 1919. And expanding the blockade after the Armistice, by the British and French fleets to the Baltic fisheries, made it worse . . . The suffering of the people in the enemy states after November 11 under the continued blockade was far more acute than that prior to the Armistice. With revolution and weakened government the old distribution and rationing machinery greatly deteriorated. Between farmers hoarding and the richer people bootlegging, a blow came to the children of Germany which subsequent large-scale American charity was not able to remedy."¹⁹⁷ This economic blockade was not removed until the Germans signed the peace treaty on June 28th, seven months and seventeen days after the fighting ended.

The burdens of the war plus the added burdens imposed by the continuation of the blockade crushed the foundations of German economic and financial life. Extreme privation and even the threat of death from starvation were brought to the mass of German people. Indelible memories of these terrible days colored German attitudes toward subsequent burdens imposed by the Treaty

of Versailles. Soon the myth was widely accepted that Germany's troubles were due predominantly to the peace treaty. The burdens imposed by the war were incomparably heavier than the burdens imposed by Versailles, and this fact should never be obscured. Nevertheless, the extra load placed upon the Germans by the treaty had the effect of the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back.

Under the auspices of the Council on Foreign Relations, Professor James W. Angell of Columbia University made an extensive study of economic conditions in Germany. With vividness he describes the situation confronting the new-born German Republic: "The Germany of 1920 was thus very different from the Germany of 1913. She had lost or ceded 13 per cent of her 1913 population, 13 per cent of her European territory, all her colonies, and about 15 per cent of her total productive capacity. The whole structure of her industry and commerce had been forced into new channels by the war, and had then been completely disorganized by the cessions under the Treaty. She had been through a political revolution, and had of necessity signed the Reparations blank check. She was far weaker economically and politically than she had been in 1913, but she was being compelled to take on burdens which in 1913 would have seemed impossible . . . The cycle of inflation, disintegration and catastrophe was soon under way."¹⁹⁸

Concerning the reparation burden of 31 billion dollars, Professor Angell wrote: "Relative to Germany's general economic condition at the time, and relative to any payments she might conceivably be capable of making in the next few years,

the figure was simply illusory. Even at the height of Germany's pre-war prosperity it would have entailed a burden far beyond her power. When applied to the Germany of 1921, weakened as she was by her own war losses and crippled by the territorial cessions stipulated in the Treaty, it was purely absurd."¹⁹⁹ This judgment is now almost universally shared by competent students, yet German failure to make the required payments provided France with an excuse to occupy the industrial heart of Germany. The results were disastrous for everybody, for Germans, Frenchmen and Europeans generally. Inflation swept away the value of German currency, as may be seen from this table:²⁰⁰

		Marks Note Circulation	Number of Marks Equaling One U.S. Dollar
200			
Jan.	6, 1923.....	1,336,500,000,000	8,695
June	7, 1923.....	9,309,532,000,000	76,923
July	7, 1923.....	20,241,750,000,000	222,222
Aug.	7, 1923.....	62,326,659,000,000	3,125,000
Sept.	7, 1923.....	1,182,039,000,000,000	33,333,333
Oct.	6, 1923.....	46,933,600,000,000,000	909,090,909
Oct.	31, 1923.....	2,496,822,908,936,000,000	166,666,666,667
Nov.	7, 1923.....	19,153,087,468,804,000,000	2,500,000,000,000
Nov.	15, 1923.....	92,844,720,742,927,000,000	4,000,000,000,000
Nov.	23, 1923.....	223,927,315,083,796,000,000	5,000,000,000,000
Nov.	30, 1923.....	400,267,640,291,760,000,000	6,666,666,666,667

The extreme degree of Germany's desperation caused the Reparations Commission to appoint the Dawes Committee to formulate a plan for the resumption of reparations payments. In September, 1924, the Dawes Plan went into effect and the stabilization of German currency was accomplished and the economic recovery of Germany proceeded at such a rapid pace that Professor Angell was able to write in the summer of 1929: "Germany has recovered. Taking the country as

a whole, she has more than made good the losses inflicted by the war and the inflation period, and in some branches of her economic life is at least as strong now as she was in 1913."²⁰¹

Two factors were primarily responsible for this almost incredible recovery: borrowing from abroad, and rationalization or the reorganization of German industries. From 1924 to the end of 1928 Germany obtained from other lands about four and a half billion dollars. About one-third of this enormous sum was in the form of short-term credits.

Then as a bolt from the heavens came the New York stock market crash and the beginning of the great American depression. As the depression deepened and extended the effects upon Germany became more serious. The situation was thus described by G. D. H. Cole, a British economist: ". . . On one country in Europe the reaction of the American boom fell far more disastrously than on the rest. Germany, since the stabilization of her currency and the readjustment of reparations under the Dawes Plan of 1924, had been energetically reconstructing her industries on the basis of an intensive mechanization which involved very heavy capital expenditure . . . During these years the Germans borrowed from investors in other countries nearly fifteen thousand million reichmarks (750,000,000 pounds at par). This was twice as much as she paid in reparations including deliveries in kind, and at least half of her total borrowings came from the United States . . . When in the United States the boom broke and the slump set in, the situation in Germany at once became far worse . . . Thus through the whole of 1930 and

1931 the German economic position became steadily more difficult and even desperate, although the German Government took the most drastic measures to deal with the situation . . . The cost of maintaining the unemployed weighed more and more heavily on the German budget, and in the early months of 1931 Germany was absolutely at the end of her tether. Only the Hoover moratorium on war debts and reparations and the Berlin 'stand-still' agreement, under which Germany's creditors agreed to postpone repayment of their short-term loans, saved her from complete economic collapse; and as both these measures were purely temporary, whereas the causes which had made them necessary showed no sign of passing away, all that was secured by them was a brief respite. There was no restoration of confidence in the future, because no one knew what was to happen when the moratorium and the 'stand-still' came to an end. There was no recovery of the German home market or of the standard of life, which indeed was pressed down further and further as the world situation became progressively worse. Germany carried on, but only by desperate measures of semi-starvation enforced by rigid governmental control at the cost of stirring up among the German people a ferment of resentment and despair."²⁰²

Early in 1931 a correspondent of a Vienna daily wrote: "Berlin was never so pitiful as it is today, never has it presented such a beaten, hopeless appearance . . . The clouds of smoke that are ascending to the heavens from all this wreckage are composed of hopelessness, poverty, hunger and the suicides . . . No one can be deceived by the fact

that a few night clubs are crowded with champaign drinkers . . . Only a few couples are dancing on the volcano that is modern Germany, and whose crater is Berlin . . . The frenzy of excited mobs, the destructive rule of immaturity, the dictatorship of adolescence, one senses these things everywhere in Germany, especially in modern Berlin."²⁰³

At the end of 1931 a British journal said: "The world today is in the grip of an earthquake, and the complex structure of international credit is shaken to its foundations . . . Once the bubble of speculation in the United States was pricked, the rest followed naturally . . . Abraham Lincoln, in a crisis of the Civil War, addressed his Cabinet: 'Now, gentlemen, we have got our harpoon into the monster, but we must still take uncommon care or else by a single flop of his tail he will send us all into eternity.' . . . the inexorable advance of the depression has pushed Germany and central Europe to the edge of the abyss . . . For the first time in modern history the City of London was unable to meet its obligations . . . The whole of Europe was shaken by the threatened failure of Germany, Austria and Hungary . . . The consequences of the Great War have visited every country in varying degree, but they seem to have converged on Germany."²⁰⁴

4. The Psychological Factors.

Extreme privation is painful enough even when recognized as the consequence of one's own mistakes or misdoings. But anguish is rendered more intense by the conviction that one's wretched condition is due to the malicious actions of enemies.

This truth must be remembered if we are to understand the behavior of the German people during the embittered truce.

Practically all Germans had vigorously supported the war with the passionate conviction that the fatherland was threatened with destruction by the encirclement of powerful enemies. Their patriotic loyalty and zeal had been equal to the devotion and fervor of French patriots. They had been as willing to suffer and die for their country as had been the people of France. Like the citizens of all belligerent lands, the Germans were victims of wartime propaganda. They were not told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, about themselves or about their enemies. Their minds were filled with exaggerations, half-truths, falsehoods. The dynamic of their actions was provided by these distorted images of themselves and of their foes.

The powerful German advance of early 1918 was interpreted as the prelude to complete triumph. All through the summer of that year the mass of German people were still supremely confident of victory. The shock produced by intimations of approaching defeat was correspondingly severe. Hope was created by the wide publicity given to the Armistice terms based upon President Wilson's Fourteen Points. After months of alternating hope and apprehension, the German people were shaken as by an earthquake by the publication of the victor's terms. Their worst fears had been surpassed. The obvious contrasts between the dictated terms and the Armistice agreement both stunned and enraged government and people alike. That they have been outrageously betrayed was the

united conviction of all Germans.

It ought to be easy for outsiders to understand this response because of the widespread realization in other lands that the Treaty of Versailles in many of its provisions did flagrantly violate the agreement upon which the Germans had laid down their arms. Dr. Charles S. Seymour, in editing Colonel House's papers, wrote: "... it is important to note that the surrender was not unconditional in either the moral or legal sense . . . On November 4 the Supreme War Council approved formally the Allied memorandum to President Wilson, which reserved free discussion on Point II, the Freedom of the Sea, and defined the meaning of 'reparation.' The memorandum carried definite endorsement of Wilson's Fourteen Points in other respects . . . Both Germany and the Allies accepted this pre-armistice agreement as the basis upon which peace should be settled."²⁰⁵ In commenting upon the Fourteen Points and the other points in President Wilson's addresses, Herbert Hoover wrote: "In general 20 out of 25 points were variously and violently attenuated by the time they came out from under the millstones of the best European diplomatic thought. America has been accused of running out on Europe after the treaty. As a matter of fact, Europe ran out on America in twenty of the Twenty-five Points."²⁰⁶ Mr. Harold Nicolson, a member of the British staff at Versailles, says that "nineteen out of President Wilson's twenty-three 'Terms of Peace' were flagrantly violated in the Treaty of Versailles as finally drafted . . . seldom in the history of man has such vindictiveness cloaked itself in such unctuous sophistry."²⁰⁷

Victims in the hour of their extremity almost

always seek a scapegoat upon which to place the blame for their misery. In this respect the Germans were no different from other members of the human race. They yielded to temptation to excuse themselves and to accuse their enemies. Thereby they intensified their own anguish. The post-war period, writes Professor Angell, "for the largest part of the German population, it was a period of terrible suffering and despair. Through five long years they lived on the extreme verge of starvation . . . The prosperity of a small minority of industrial and financial leaders and speculators, and of the agriculturists, was no offset to the general distress and poverty. The health and strength of the present generation were permanently impaired, and its growth in numbers was retarded. The psychological consequences were also necessarily bad, and the morale of the people was lowest at precisely the time when the severest demands were placed upon it . . . The full effects, which became apparent only in later years, were almost as bad as those of the war itself: great gaps in the child population because of the high infant mortality and a low birth rate; many of the remaining children undernourished, rickety, or tubercular; a disproportionately high death rate among adults; and a protracted weakening of the health and strength of the country's labor power."²⁰⁸ In 1923, writes Professor Shotwell, "Germany plumbed the depth of national despair . . . there was a sense of utter defeat and helplessness. The resentment against the French was bitter to the point of sullen wrath which had all the elements of war psychology. The presence of black troops in French garrisons in occupied Germany added fuel to the

resentment. Indeed, it is doubtful if, in the heart of the war, there was ever such a wave of hatred as that invoked by the policy of Poincare. It strengthened the tendency to believe everything bad about the Allied and Associated Powers, England's 'duplicity' and Wilson's 'betrayal' of the fourteen points."²⁰⁹

By 1931 a British journal was saying: "Europe is mad—mad with fears and jealousies, with false ideals, with wounded pride and fatuous ambitions . . . The suppression of Germany thwarts or retards every effort for international settlement or pacification. Is it not time that we ceased using the Treaty of Versailles as a sort of combined Bible and thumb-screw? Twelve years have given ample opportunity for seeing the injustices and blunders that were committed at the Paris Peace Conference. It is impossible to prolong these for another twelve years, and it is foolish to prolong them half or a quarter of that time. A revision of the treaties—an honest attempt even to modify some of their worse features—would have a powerful effect in Germany."²¹⁰

5. *The Political Factors.*

Hitler's rise to power and consequent ability to wage war were made possible by the titanic burdens which the new Republic was compelled to carry and by inherent weaknesses in German democracy and by serious mistakes made by successive administrations.

The German Republic was the child of defeat in war and consequent collapse of the monarchy. It came into being at a time of unprecedented national disaster and appalling suffering for most of its people. "It was a sullen, resentful Germany

which greeted the passing of the Weimar Constitution, a Germany which was not in the mood to do anything, much less seek to realize the ideals expressed in that document. The national morale had been gravely shaken, and the nation as a whole concentrated on chewing the cud of its own hatred while the social fabric went to ruin. Instead of zeal of work came apathy; instead of co-operation came disunion, instead of solidarity came selfish individual effort. Mutilated and crushed, the German nation, in depressed exhaustion, threatened to be as dangerous to Europe as to itself."²¹¹ From the beginning the government was obliged to bear the odium of having signed the shameful instrument of Versailles. The sacred soil of the fatherland was occupied by foreign troops, including black soldiers from the French colonies. Reparation payments had to be made, in kind and in cash. High taxes had to be imposed. Then came the French invasion of the Ruhr, the wrecking of German industry, and the astronomical inflation of German currency. And all this happened before the German Republic had reached the age of five!

A tragically short period of rising prosperity was abruptly terminated by the world wide economic depression which swept over Germany with especial fury. Early in 1932 John Maynard Keynes was writing: "Germany today is in the grip of the most terrible deflation that any nation has experienced . . . Nearly a third of the population is out of work. The standards of life of those still employed have been cruelly curtailed . . . Hamburg, living in a stupor, many miles of ships laid up silent in its harbour . . . is a symbol of

Germany under the Great Deflation—a worse visitation, if it is to be continued, than even the Great Inflation was a few years ago.”²¹² Not many months thereafter the German Republic broke down and was replaced by dictatorship.

This downfall was brought about in part by inherent weaknesses in German democracy which reduced the ability of the government to carry the colossal burdens imposed upon it by defeat, inflation and deflation. Internal dissention was the most serious of these defects. Wide and deep were the cleavages separating the proletariat, the peasants, the Junkers, the professional soldiers, the industrialists, the middle class, the students, the civil servants. Patriotic nationalism was the cement which had held together these sharply divergent elements of the population. Defeat brought disillusionment, despair, disunity.

The old regime collapsed so utterly that the new government was established practically without violence. The Social Democrats were the strongest party and they took control. Immediately there was sharp controversy concerning policy and the Independent Socialists withdrew from the cabinet. This group in turn was quickly divided by the secession of the Spartacists. This section was bitterly hostile to the Majority Socialists and openly propagandized for violent seizure of power and the establishment of a Communist government along Russian lines. Its leaders Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were brutally murdered by men in uniform on January 4, 1919, and the Spartacist movement was suppressed by government troops. The Independent Socialists subsequently re-united with the Majority So-

cialists, but the cleavage between Socialists and Communists was never bridged and mutual hostility became more extreme.

The government was also violently assailed from the right. During the week of March 13, 1920, Berlin itself was seized by extreme Nationalists under the leadership of Dr. Kapp, and the President with members of his cabinet fled to Dresden. Within a few days the Kapp Putsch was ended by the paralysis produced by a general strike of workers loyal to the government. But the hostility between right and left grew even more bitter. Thus the Social Democrats throughout the lifetime of the Republic were constantly and violently assailed by the Communists on the one hand and by the Nationalists on the other. They were never able to gain an outright majority in the Reichstag. Dissension was made more extreme by the adoption in the Constitution of the system of proportional representation. Government by coalition became therefore the only practicable parliamentary procedure. Coalition operates efficiently in wartime because of the cement of patriotism, the fear of defeat and the hope of victory. But in a society of yawning chasms under conditions of economic desperation and emotional excesses, extreme dissension in politics leads inexorably to national disaster. The nature and extent of Germany's political malady is reflected in the table and chart of members elected to the Reichstag by the many parties in the frequent elections, on page 80.

In Communist circles the rise of Hitler to power is attributed to the timidity and cowardice of the Social Democrats in failing to take advantage of

the revolutionary situation in 1918 by seizing power and establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat along Russian lines. This point of view overlooks the crucial fact that the Allies would quickly have overturned such a regime in Germany. The fear of Bolshevism was wide and deep in France and among conservatives in the British Isles and in the United States. A Communist government in Germany could not have consented to the payment of huge sums annually in reparations or carried out the other terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Surely it is plain that a Communist dictatorship could not function under Allied armies of occupation.

Moreover, such a dictatorship would have been resisted violently by large sections of the German people, including a substantial proportion of soldiers and sailors. Even at the height of the revolutionary situation on November 10, 1918, the advocates of Communist dictatorship constituted only a tiny fraction of the 3,000 delegates at a mass meeting of the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils. Liebknecht was powerless to prevent the delegates from confirming the Social Democratic ministers of the Provisional Government.²¹⁸ In the 1920 Reichstag election, the Communists were able to poll only 590,000 votes, or about two per cent of the total. Communists and Communist sympathizers never exceeded one German out of six, as may be seen from the accompanying table. Even as late as the Presidential election of 1932, the Communist vote was less than one out of seven of all votes cast, and in the run-off vote for President the Communist candidate received less than one out of nine votes cast.

By conviction and temperament the Social Dem-

THE POLITICAL FACTORS

ocrats were strongly opposed to violent seizure of power, the establishment of a dictatorship, and the liquidation of opponents. They believed thoroughly in democracy and the democratic processes of parliamentary government. They had long been schooled in the idea of the inevitable decay of capitalism and the gradual establishment of socialism. Nothing was further from their thought than the plunging of Germany into the blood bath of civil war.

"The Germans somehow found themselves suddenly before an abyss," writes a French scholar, Henri Lichtenberger. "When they saw thrones and governments falling around them, when Workers' and Soldiers' Councils sprang up on all sides, when the cities resounded with the crackling of machine guns and the explosion of grenades, the onlookers of the overturn believed that they distinguished in the sky the bloody gleam of the 'great night' so long heralded by the prophets of revolution. And in a cold fit of anguish they wondered if the bolshevist wave which had submerged Russia would now flow down from the Vistula to the Rhine; if Germany in its turn was not going to experience all the horrors of civil war and the calamities of general anarchy. For a time the terror of the red specter haunted the minds of the people . . . Very quickly the organized German workers came to understand the fundamental difference which separated Germany from Russia and they foresaw the irreparable catastrophe which the sudden realization of communism, such as had been established in Russia, would bring on Germany, a country of scientifically organized big industry."²¹⁴

THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR II

This terror of Bolshevism never faded from the minds of a substantial proportion of the German people and provided a powerful dynamic of Hitlerism. The part played by German Communists in stimulating the growth of Nazism was increased by their virulent hostility to the Social Democrats and the consequent weakening of the forces of democracy. The Communist Party in Germany was, of course, a part of the monolithic Third International, the Comintern. As such the German branch was under the complete control of the Russians in Moscow who dominated the Comintern. Concerning the importance of this fact, Professor Calvin B. Hoover, says: ". . . the Communist leaders in Germany were never free to make whatever decisions they thought might be in the best interests of the German Communist Party, or, if they did make such decisions, they were always in danger of having them over-ruled by Moscow . . . Orders from Moscow made it impossible for the Communist leaders to cooperate in any way with the Social Democratic leaders. Instead, the supremely silly epithet 'Social-Fascist' was coined and applied to the Social Democrats. If the Social Democrats favored anything, the Communists must oppose it."²¹⁵ The Communists were even more bitterly hostile to the Social Democrats than they were to the Nazis. The official party line was stated in the *Pravda*, the official organ of the Communist Party in Moscow: "The Communists set themselves the task of proving to the masses with all possible clarity that Social Democracy is the chief obstacle to the destruction of capitalism and in the fight against Fascist dictatorship." This quotation brought from the *Living Age* this comment:

"The official 'party line' is that Hitler is a mere puppet, that his ideas are absurd, and that his arrival in power would speedily be followed by an internal collapse or a foreign war, either of which would create a revolutionary situation nearly as acute as that of Russia in 1917 and therefore adapted to a Communist *coup d' e'tat*."²¹⁶

One of the most discerning interpretations of the role of the Communists in preparing the way for Hitlerism comes from a British writer, R. T. Clark: "Unless it is realized that the German Communist leadership had no specific German interest, but was merely a Russian agency, the history of the party is quite inexplicable. . . . thanks to heresy hunts and doctrinal disputes, its leadership constantly changed till every man of independent views was weeded out. The leadership was kept under strict control . . . It could do nothing, not even conduct a minor party argument on doctrine, without a packet of instructions from Moscow . . . Its one positive deed was to stab German democracy in the back and paralyze its resistance to counter-revolution."²¹⁷

In the autobiography of Miss Toni Sender, a left-wing leader of the Independent Social Democrats in the Reichstag, we read: "When I was through a Communist took the floor, attacking me, attacking the Weimar constitution and the Weimar republic . . . Dr. Breitscheid, the leader of the Socialist Reichstag group proposed to the Communists a cessation of the differences that separated the two movements. He offered cooperation in the fight against Hitler's fascism. The next day, November 16, 1931, he received a sneering answer in the *Rote Fahne*, the Communist newspaper in

Berlin: 'Our chief enemy is the Social Democratic party!' . . . How often in the plenary hall of the Reichstag were we confronted with the grotesque picture of the Nazi, Frick, in eager conversation with the Communist, Torgler. They were planning their tactics together."²¹⁸

Thus the democratic socialists of Germany were on the one hand controlled by actions of the French and other Allies, and were on the other harassed and weakened by the orders coming from Moscow.

Part of the failure of the Social Democrats was due to the retention in government service of large numbers of officials and civil servants who did not believe in democracy and who were opposed to the idea of a German Republic. In retrospect it is easy to say that all these relics of the old regime should have been kicked out bag and baggage. Social Democratic leaders themselves subsequently recognized the blunder of permitting extreme opponents to remain in key positions in many departments of government. But a clean sweep was out of the question under prevailing conditions—the suddenness of the collapse of the monarchy and the unexpectedness of the Kaiser's abdication, the enormous complexity of transferring authority and power to a democratic administration, the degree of economic desperation and the extent of social chaos, the tragic inadequacy of trained socialist leadership, the speed with which decisions had to be made: all these factors made it impossible to retain in office only genuine sympathizers with the new regime.

Among the reasons for the collapse of the German Republic we must therefore include: the eco-

nomic privation and desperation of the German people, the extreme degrees of hatred and passion, the extent of political dissension and the inability of the Social Democrats to obtain actual power while they were in office, the unrelenting hostility of Russian-controlled Communists, the unreliability and even treachery of many officials and civil servants who sympathized with the old regime, the burdens of French domination, and, yet to be considered, the failure of the disarmament conferences.

6. *The Failure of the Disarmament Conference.*

The contrast between Germany's military impotence and the armed might of France and the other Allies was a primary reason for the growth of Hitlerism and the undermining of the German Republic. Just as Germany did not surrender unconditionally, but on the basis of definite promises as to the nature of the peace, likewise Germany did not accept disarmament unconditionally, but on the basis of official Allied statements that her disarmament would be the beginning of a general reduction of armaments. These commitments were made in Part V of the Treaty of Versailles, and in Part V of *The Reply of the Allied and Associated Powers to the Observations of the German Delegation on the Conditions of Peace*, and in Article VIII of the Covenant of the League of Nations. That these promises were not carried out was the passionate conviction of practically all Germans. Hitler came into power not because Germany was armed and ready for aggression; he rode into dictatorship upon the explosive demand for equality in armaments and in status. Upon this rock all hopes of disarmament were wrecked.

THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR II

The General Disarmament Conference began its first session on February 2, 1932, in Geneva. It was one of the most impressive assemblies of statesmen ever to meet. There were present eight heads of governments and more than fifty other cabinet ministers from sixty-one nations. Twelve years had been spent in preparation for the conference. A thousand statesmen and publicists all over the earth had uttered solemn warnings that failure to reach agreements would lead to the outbreak of another great war. The conference dragged along for two years and ended in utter failure. Five years later in 1939 began the long-predicted war. The coming of no war in history was ever more clearly foreseen and more frequently predicted.

France was unyielding in her insistence upon preponderance of power over Germany. Twice within the experience of that generation France had been ravaged by foes from across the Rhine. Suspicion and fear of Germany guided every French action. No faith could be placed in any German promise. The only language the Germans understood was that of armed might. Therefore security for France was to be found only in contrast, contrast between German weakness and French strength. France was willing to reduce her own armaments to the degree that Great Britain and the United States would use their armaments in her defense and to the extent that the League of Nations was authorized and empowered to use international police in maintaining French supremacy over Germany.

By 1932 the state of mind of practically all Germans made impossible peaceful acceptance of

THE FAILURE OF THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

France's domination. Eighteen years of never-ending crisis; accumulating years of privation, frustration and despair; thirteen years of brooding over the contrast between the Armistice terms and the actual provisions of the Treaty; and ever deepening inclination to blame France for all their troubles—these made it impossible for any German government to remain in office if it consented to the continuation of the contrast between Germany's impotence and France's might. Steadily widening was the myth that the war had been lost because of "the stab in the back" by pacifists and Socialists and Jews. Condemnation of the Social Democracy for having signed the odious Treaty and for having maintained the policy of fulfillment was becoming more extreme. To everybody it was plain that failure of the disarmament conference would carry with it the collapse of the German Republic and the establishment of dictatorship.

All this proved to the French that their fears were justified. The more Germany moved to the right, the deeper became the conviction in France that security was to be found only in irresistible armed power. Let it be remembered that when the Disarmament Conference began there were 107 Nazi followers of Hitler sitting as elected members of the Reichstag, and before the conference finally collapsed this number had increased to 230. For generations to come historians will emphasize this tragedy: France's policy made inevitable the intensification of German nationalism and German insistence upon equality of status and equality of armaments; but this very insistence made more immovable French determination to keep Germany weak and to retain France's armed supremacy; but

this very determination was a primary factor in the downfall of the German Republic, the rise of Hitlerism, and the outbreak of war. A policy of suspicion, fear and domination always brings its own justification in the response of its victims. Under the provocation of French policy the Germans behaved in the way that the French predicted.

This explains why the Disarmament Conference dragged along month after month without agreement to reduce armaments, in spite of repeated Allied promises and in spite of twelve years of preparation for the Conference. The French not only had determination, they had power. During that period France and her allies were absolutely supreme on the continent and no agreement could be reached without their consent. Germany was weak but entirely unwilling to continue the contrast between her disarmament and the armed might of her enemies. When Brüning returned empty-handed from Geneva to face the inevitable, he was dismissed by the aged President Hindenburg, on May 30, 1932, replaced by von Papen, and the "prelude to Hitler" was ushered in.

Germany's utter helplessness in the face of France's domination was the theme of countless Nazi orations. Hitler himself stressed this fact incessantly and vehemently, as may be seen from the collection of addresses translated into English and published with the title, *Disarmament and Equal Rights*, edited by Richard Schmidt and Adolf Grabowsky. The louder Hitler shouted and shrieked, the more determined became the French to maintain security through absolute preponderance of armed power. On October 14, 1933, Ger-

WHAT WOULD OTHER PEOPLES HAVE DONE?

many withdrew from the Disarmament Conferences and resigned from the League of Nations. Six years later the war began which had long been foreseen and frequently predicted.

7. What Would Englishmen, Frenchmen, Americans Have Done?

Before we consider the sinister role of Hitler and the fatal program of the Nazi, let us get the feel of the situation in Germany at the end of 1932 and form a judgment as to the probable actions of other peoples if placed in a parallel position. What would Englishmen, Frenchmen, Americans have done:

if they had fought patriotically for four years against terrific odds in defense of their homes and of their country, as they passionately believed;

if they had been beaten by the superior resources of their enemies and had surrendered, not unconditionally, but on definite promises;

if they had been betrayed by having those pledges torn into shreds;

if they had been blockaded for seven months after laying down their arms;

if they had been compelled to submit to armies of occupation, including primitive troops from Africa;

if they had been deprived of substantial areas of their territory;

if they had been subjected to vigorous and sustained efforts to divide their country into various independent provinces;

if they had been saddled with a crushing indemnity which called for annual payments until 1988;

if they had been compelled to sign a treaty in

which they admitted that their responsibility for causing the war justified the penalties imposed upon them;

if they had been ravaged alternately by catastrophic inflation and ruinous deflation, with consequent extreme privation, frustration and despair;

if they had undergone revolutionary change in form of government in the hour of defeat;

if the population had been torn with bitter dissension;

if the contrast between their own disarmament and the armed might of their enemies had year after year become more galling and unbearable—

if Englishmen, Frenchmen, Americans had lived under these conditions year after year, what would they have done?

Surely the answer is clear: they would have become ever more extreme in their demands, ever more insistent that they be accorded a status of justice and equality and security; they would have turned in despair and rage against moderate and pacific statesmen and given their passionate allegiance to leaders who most eloquently voiced their hatreds and their clamors for vengeance. Can there be any doubt as to the nature of the action that would have been taken under these conditions by members of the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor, the Chamber of Commerce, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Farmers Grange, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Bankers Association, the Sons of the Golden West, the Klu Klux Klan, the Navy League, the Democratic Party, the Republican Party? Militant and aggressive and ruthless action would have been taken under these circumstances

by victims who were inflamed by the passions of nationalism, whether they were citizens of England, France, the United States, or Germany.

"There is nothing to be surprised at in having 'a government of the Right' in Germany," editorialized the *New Statesman and Nation* of London on June 11, 1932. "The wonder is that the post-war pacificism and Liberalism of Germany would have so long survived. The strain has been terrific: the loss of territory, the currency collapse, the occupation of the Ruhr, the burden of reparations, the mountainous taxation, the consciousness of being the one unarmed nation among neighbours who manifestly never intended to honour their pledge also to disarm—on the top of all this an economic depression such as we in this country have so far never experienced or imagined. The German people have remained astonishingly patient."

About ten months before the opening of the Disarmament Conference, Viscount Cecil wrote: "It ought to be inconceivable that the representatives of sixty 'civilized' nations should meet to settle the form of a treaty which they all professedly desire and should separate without even a partial agreement. But remembering the incredible follies of 1914 one must admit that internationally anything may happen . . . The consideration that forces us to definite and immediate action is 'scrupulous respect for treaty obligations.' The pledge originally given by M. Clemenceau on behalf of the Allied and Associated Powers, reenforced by Article 8 of the various treaties of peace, and constantly reiterated in resolutions and declarations in the Assembly of the League of Nations, still awaits fulfillment . . . If these pledges are to be treated as 'scraps of

paper,' the whole basis on which the organization of peace rests will be undermined. Succeed we must. The alternative is too sinister for man or woman of good-will to contemplate."²¹⁹

About six months before the Disarmament Conference assembled, Viscount Cecil again wrote: "The obligation to join in general disarmament has never been denied by responsible statesmen on the side of the Allies . . . Nothing poisons and destroys mutual confidence so much in international, as in private life, as the failure to keep troth. Unquestionably, one source of the disquieting symptoms in Central Europe is the Allied failure to disarm. The acute economic distress of Germany, which as in other countries has caused a wave of xenophobia, has served to increase and popularize indignation on this point until the assumption that Germany was perfidiously tricked by the Allies into a position of humiliating inferiority has become the commonplace of German political journalism."²²⁰

On October 9, 1931, General Smuts, in an address at Sheffield University, warned: "The armed peace continues in an aggravated form, and so long as it continues mankind seems to be marching to some horrible doom. Unless a real measure of disarmament puts an end to the armed peace, we are making for another cataclysm which will be infinitely worse than the horrors of the Great War."²²¹

A thousand similar warnings could be assembled. Unless the exposed powder mines were removed an explosion was certain to occur. Adolf Hitler, the embittered and impassioned, proved to be the leader who threw the lighted match into the

accumulated combustibles. To him belongs the infamy of having precipitated World War II. Indelible is this stain and the passing centuries will never erase it from the scroll of time. But historians will also record the fact that the pathetic and tragic and repulsive victim of the troubled times in which he lived merely threw twigs upon the massive bonfire of explosives which was Europe and then tossed a lighted match. Granted the continuation of French policy, and granted the consequences for the Republic across the Rhine, the Germans would have again fought the French even if Adolf Hitler had never been born.

In 1934 an outstanding British historian pointed out that "again and again, with all the eloquence and sincerity at their command, Streseman and Bruning warned the Allied Statesmen, and their warnings were repeated within the Allied countries themselves, that persistence in attempting to keep Germany permanently in subjection must inevitably end in national revolution and all that that implied. Again and again they assured us that it needed only a gesture of understanding from abroad to enable them to meet this new spirit of regeneration in Germany with an open hand, and to control and utilize it in building up a new state of which Europe might be proud. The warnings fell upon deaf ears. France could not, and England, apparently would not, hear. Relentlessly they held their same course, and in Germany the last Chancellors of the Republic, Bruning, von Papen, and von Schleicher, struggled vainly to keep in check the rising tide of National Socialism. The end came on 30th January, 1933, when Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor and the Weimar

System vanished in blood and recrimination."²²²

8. *The Role of Adolf Hitler.*

Hitler did not create the conditions out of which came World War II, but he did powerfully affect the course of events. He was the evil genius who had much to do with the precipitation of war and with the degree of its virulence. The conditions if maintained would have brought war without Hitler, but the war itself was different because of the part he played.

Everybody knows that Hitler was not a German but an Austrian. On the eve of his nomination for the Presidency he was hurriedly admitted to German citizenship by the device of technical employment as a minor official of the State of Brunswick, which automatically carried with it the privileges of German citizenship. Thus by virtue of the appointment as a member of the Brunswick Legation in Berlin, Hitler qualified as a candidate for the Presidency of Germany.

Much of Hitler's power was derived from his unexcelled gift of oratory. He possessed superlative ability to move masses of people to frenzies of emotion and to dynamic action. He made effective use of pageantry and symbolism and pomp. He appealed to the emotions, and not to the minds, of his hearers. Tens of thousands of entranced listeners left his meetings thrilled to the depth of their beings.

Passion for nation and race constituted the dynamic of his actions. Hitler "loved" Germany and the Germans as few patriots have ever loved country. His orations were nationalistic to the most extreme degree. He appealed alternately to pride

and to hatred. He romanticized Germany's past and glorified her military virtues and mighty victories. He poured out the vials of his wrath upon the pacifists and the Socialists and the Jews who had "stabbed Germany in the back" and brought about her defeat. He hated the Communists and he hated the French. His addresses were explosions, his impassioned words were bayonet-thrusts.

Hitler promised everything to everybody. He dramatized the suffering and frustration and misery of various sections of the German people, the middle-class, the students, the peasants, the proletarians, and offered deliverance to each group in turn. He did not attempt to convince but to arouse. If given power he would break the strangle-hold of the peoples' oppressors: Socialists and Communists, Jews and French. He would tear up the infamous bond of Versailles, restore the might of German arms, throw off the last vestige of foreign enslavement, and march to Germany's rightful place in the sun, the place of superiority and domination. To the industrialists and bankers, he promised deliverance from the threat of Bolshevism. To his personal followers he promised the property and the positions of the treacherous Jews. To the peasants he offered land and freedom and prosperity. To the students he offered jobs and responsibility in building the new order of Europe.

One observer of the contemporary scene in Germany has gathered together the following assortment of promises made by Hitler: "Abolition" of the Treaty of Versailles, equality of rights in international dealings; reunion of "all Germans on the basis of the right of self-determination of peoples;" land and colonies "for settling our sur-

plus population;" a conscript army; "the creation of a strong central power of the Reich;" "unconditional authority" at the top; "the schools must aim at teaching the pupil to understand the idea of the State;" "the creation of a German national press;" "it must be forbidden to publish newspapers which do not conduce to the national welfare;" "positive Christianity;" "the common interest before self-interest;" a bigger and better public health program, protection of mothers and infants, and more physical training; "abolition of incomes unearned by work;" "abolition of the thralldom of interest;" confiscation of war profits; nationalization of trusts; "profit-sharing in the great industries;" "creation of a healthy middle class;" "communi-
zation" of department stores; "prohibition of land speculation;" "abolition of interest on mortgages;" capital punishment for "usurèrs and profiteers"—the emphasis on what in 1935 was hailed as "freedom" and on the economic sorrows of the middle class.²²³

Hitler's promises brought the thrill of hope to millions who were living in privation and frustration and despair. The contrast in their minds between the terrible actuality of their condition and the glorious vision of the future galvanized multitudes into frenzied action. Revolution does not come merely from misery. Revolution comes when miserable victims are energized by hope. Without the condition of mass suffering and bitterness, there would have been no Nazi revolution; and without the hope engendered by Hitler, there would have been no Nazi revolution.

This hatred and this hope were the result not only of intolerable conditions and of Hitler's elo-

quence, but also of Nazi efficiency in propaganda. Early in his career, Hitler discovered the power of half-truth, exaggeration, misrepresentation, and falsehood. He and his colleagues developed to the highest degree of effectiveness the art of inflaming and infuriating the populace. The chief propagandist Dr. Goebbels said that his function was "to unchain volcanic passions, to arouse outbreaks of fury, to set masses of men on the march, to organize hate and suspicion with ice-cold calculation." Upon the impressionable minds of youth who had never known any condition except that of war and post-war upheaval this propaganda fell with the fury of a mountain torrent.

The conditions, the eloquence, the technique of propaganda—these were supplemented effectively by resort to organized violence against opponents. The ranks of the Nazis included many psychopathic and neurotic victims of the war and the continuing social tension. Sexual perverts were often placed in positions of authority within the party. Killing had long been the business of that generation, killing under the most expert instruction. Wartime conditions had for millions shattered morals to the degree that right and wrong were no longer rooted in principle but were determined solely by desire and passion. Under these conditions in any land chronic resort to violence is inevitable. In post-war Germany the cult of violence played a major role in the social struggle. The Communists stood ready to use clubs and bayonets against their opponents. Indeed, they frequently joined with the Nazis in violent attacks upon Social Democrats. Violence on the part of Communists provoked Nazi gangsters to more extreme degrees

of terrorism. Vast numbers of Jews were brutally beaten and many were bestially murdered. Organized gangsters became the orthodox instrument of political action and the Storm Troopers trampled down opposition.

Another potent factor in Hitler's rise to power was the Nazi doctrine of the state and its theory of leadership. In contrast to the democratic idea that the State is the servant of individuals and that the people should control government, the Nazi doctrine was that the State is supreme, the individual being merely a cell in the body politic, and that public policy should be determined by the elite. Policy should come from the top and be imposed upon citizens at the bottom. This theoretical rejection of the parliamentary procedure made a dramatic and dynamic appeal to millions of German victims of privation, frustration and bitterness who found it increasingly easy to believe that their troubles were due to the French and to the Social Democrats. Under conditions of social insecurity and chaos, dictatorship appears to be vastly more efficient than democratic procedure. Over against the stigma attached the Weimar regime which had signed the Treaty of shame and which was attempting the policy of fulfillment, was the glamour of the Fuehrer with his eloquence, his pageantry, his ecstatic devotees, and the thrill of hope which he engendered.

Thus millions of Germans were led to offer Adolf Hitler their undivided allegiance, their total loyalty. As the symbol and the instrument of the new German nation and the new German race, he became the idolized leader. So we hear a Nazi official exclaim: "Formerly, we were in the habit

THE ROLE OF ADOLF HITLER

of saying: this is right or wrong; today, we must put the question accordingly: What would the Fuhrer say? This attitude towards the Fuhrer as well as his own person, are the categorical Imperative to which German life must henceforth conform. We are under the great obligation of recognizing as a holy work of our Volk's spirit the laws signed by Adolf Hitler's name. Hitler has received his authority from God. Therefore he is a champion, sent by God, for German Right in the world."²²⁴ This supreme fidelity brought ecstatic joy to millions of Germans who had hitherto been hopeless and unhappy, and released vast power into German life which had long been dormant. Here was something for which one could live, and for which he could die.

Americans who have lived through two world wars ought to find it easy to understand this response of the Germans to the appeal of Hitler. In wartime in any land with highly developed nationalism, supreme allegiance to the State is required of patriots. Every form of control of individual action deemed necessary to victory is imposed. Unquestioned obedience is expected from civilian and soldier alike. Men in the armed forces are not supposed to ask "why?" or to be able to give reasons for their actions. Under command they march to victory or death. *This absolute domination of men's minds and emotions by nationalism is the key to an understanding of the rise of Nazism.* The degree of absoluteness of its sway is measured by the extent and severity of the crisis. Let the fact be burned into consciousness that Adolf Hitler came into power in the nineteenth year of cataclysmic crisis in Germany. "In the course of fifteen years,

three catastrophes befell Germany. The first, the military catastrophe in 1918, gave birth to the Republic. From the second, the utter collapse of the currency in 1923, the young Republic seemingly recovered miraculously, but in reality the social repercussions and consequences of the inflation were a continual drain of its vitality. The third and final catastrophe, the economic crisis of the early 1930's, resulted in the downfall of the Republic."²²⁵

Well may the question be raised again: what would American patriots have done *in the nineteenth year* of a parallel crisis? Any people in any land under similar conditions would have turned to their own Hitler and would have followed him blindly to victory or to death. And any Hitler in any country of fiery nationalism would have promised deliverance to his enslaved people and would have adopted extreme measures of aggression which would have still further inflamed the passions of nationalism and thereby made the outbreak of war a mere matter of time. Adolf Hitler was the occasion but not the cause of World War II.

9. *The German Republic Could Have Been Preserved.*

The Second World War might have been averted if the German Republic had survived, because the conditions which were required for the undergirding of the Republic were the very conditions which had to be fulfilled if the explosive passions of nationalism on both sides of the Rhine were to subside.

Mr. Winston Churchill, in his four-volume his-

tory of the First World War, has a chapter in which he contrasts what happened at Versailles with what might have happened. He makes use of the literary device of a dream, and has the sleeping Clemenceau say to himself: "I have got to think of the long safety of France . . . Now is the appointed time for making friends with Germany and ending the quarrel of so many centuries. *We, the weaker, have got them down; we, the conquerors, will lift them up.*"²²⁶

Mr. Churchill presents this idea in the form of a dream, but the economic restoration of Germany was widely recognized in Allied lands as an essential condition of peace. The argument was simple and clear: Europe has become an economic unity; Germany is the industrial heart of the continent; if that heart is dealt a serious blow, the entire body will be paralyzed; continuing prosperity in France depends upon prosperity across the river. If this point of view had become predominant in Paris and London and Washington, the central problem of international relations would have been thus stated: *how can we help lift up the Germans, now that we have them down?*

There was an answer to this question. It was presented by numerous economists, publicists and statesmen in England, France, and the United States. The requirements of the situation included: (1) immediate removal of the blockade and embargo; (2) immediate relief on a substantial scale; (3) the extension to German industry of adequate long-time credits; (4) favorable access by Germany to essential raw materials: (5) favorable access to the most prosperous customers throughout

the earth; (6) international stabilization of exchange.

If the Allied governments had realized the true nature of the problem and if they had proceeded with determination, they could have lifted Germany and steadied her. Of course, this would have required the payment of a price. Peace as well as war is expensive. The economic restoration of Germany might have required the advance to Germany by the Allies of a sum as huge as ten billion dollars. This is a lot of money, but it is a mere three per cent of the three hundred billion dollars World War II has already cost the people of the United States alone; and is less than the incalculable cost of the world depression which might have been averted by this new international policy. Moreover, this ten billions advanced to the Germans probably would have returned to Allied peoples greatly multiplied in the form of repayment of loans and the increase of foreign trade and the undergirding of general prosperity. Truly the sleeping Clemenceau spoke words of wisdom: "We, the weaker, have got them down; we, the conquerors, will lift them up."

The thrilling possibilities of this procedure are emphasized by a study of the actual situation in Germany during the period of recovering prosperity from 1924 to 1928. Fortunately, the essential data has been assembled by a competent American economist, Professor James W. Angell, of Columbia University, under the auspices of the Council on Foreign Relations. Writing in the summer of 1929, Professor Angell said: "In most respects, with the exception of agriculture and foreign trade, German economic life has now re-

gained or more than regained the pre-war levels. Despite the loss of territory under the terms of the Treaty of Peace, the aggregate volume of production is materially larger than it was in 1913, the average prosperity of the people as a whole is a little greater, and Germany's industrial leadership on the Continent has been conclusively reestablished. The prospects for the future are good."²²⁷

This spectacular recovery was made possible in considerable part by funds obtained from abroad in these forms:²²⁸

6,200 million marks in long-term loans;
 6,000 million marks in short-term credits;
 6,000 million marks in German securities sold
 ————— to foreigners.

18,200 million marks total from abroad (about
 four and one-half billion dollars)

It will be observed that two-thirds of this amount was highly vulnerable, that is, these foreign funds could quickly be withdrawn or the German securities dumped on the market. The total of long-term foreign loans to Germans was only one and one-half billion dollars.

The optimistic account of German economic life by Professor Angell went to press in the fall of 1929 just as the Wall Street stock market crash was resounding over the earth. In a Postscript to a revised edition published in 1932, the author said: "... beginning in 1929, the world's financial mechanism was subjected to a series of major shocks ... The inception of this series of financial shocks really dates back to the negotiations over the drafting of the Young Plan, in the spring of 1929. The negotiations eventually proved successful ... But the procedure was long drawn out, and

in the earlier stages a great deal of unrest and even fear was aroused in the world money markets over its possible outcome. The tangible expression of this fear was the cessation of new loans to Germany, and the withdrawal of large blocks of funds already placed with her . . . The crisis itself was quickly surmounted, but a serious blow had been dealt to the world's business and financial structure, the first in some years. Then a few months later came the collapse of the New York stock market."²²⁹ Then in 1931 came Germany's effort to form a customs union with Austria, and France's veto of the proposal. This was followed by the failure of the largest bank in Austria. "Bear speculators all over the world took advantage of this period of uncertainty to sell German currency; banks and investors abroad became frightened; a real foreign exchange panic developed within Germany itself; and the long-threatened financial deluge at last descended."²³⁰

There is thus an abundance of evidence to show that enduring prosperity could have been established in Germany if the Allies had been wise enough and determined enough to help lift Germany to her feet. It was possible to follow this procedure: remove the blockade, provide substantial relief, extend Germans long-term credits, provide favorable access for Germans to raw materials and to markets, and stabilize international exchange. The total immediate cost of this program would have been substantial, but the long-term gains for everybody on earth would have been incalculable.

The Allies could have further strengthened the German Republic by reducing the psychological

THE GERMAN REPUBLIC COULD HAVE BEEN PRESERVED

causes of enmity and belligerency. Instead of inserting Article 231 in the Treaty and thereby compelling Germany to admit that she had caused war, the Allies might have recognized and asserted that the war came from prevailing international arrangements in which all the great powers were involved. Instead of facing Germany with hypocrisy and arrogance, the Allies might have shown penitence and humility. This new attitude would have taken from Hitler one of his most dynamic arguments.

The German Republic could have been preserved if the Allies had committed themselves resolutely to this economic program and if they had manifested this new spirit. It is easy to see from the table on the next page, of the total votes cast in the various German elections of members of the Reichstag how the Nazi vote went up as the people plunged deeper into depression, and that it fell as the population rose in economic well-being. In the election of December, 1924, the Nazi vote was 6.5 per cent of the total; in May, 1928, with increased prosperity, it dropped to 2.6 per cent; but in September, 1930, a depression period, it rose to 18.3 per cent, and in July, 1932, to 37.9 per cent.²³¹ In 1928 the Nazis elected twelve members of the Reichstag, but during the depression of 1930 they elected 107 members and polled 6,400,000 votes.

The possibilities of improved relations between Germany and France were revealed during the period following the signing of the Locarno treaties in 1925. In these documents Germany agreed to accept as permanent the western boundaries as drawn by the Treaty of Versailles and to submit

THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR II

all controversies of every kind with France to some form of peaceful settlement. Provision was made

PERCENTAGE OF VOTES IN VARIOUS REICHSTAG ELECTIONS ²³²										
(The parties are listed from extreme right to extreme left.)										
	Jan. '19	June '20	May '24	Dec. '24	May '28	Sept. '30	July '32	Nov. '32		
National Socialist.....			6.5	3.0	2.6	18.3	37.9	33.5		
National People's.....	10.3	15.1	19.5	20.5	14.3	7.0	6.1	9.2		
Christian Social People's.....					1.9	2.5	0.5	1.0		
Peasants and Country People's						3.2	0.2	0.5		
Farmers Union.....			2.0	1.7	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.4		
Economic	0.9	0.8	2.4	3.3	4.5	3.9	0.1			
People's	4.4	14.0	9.2	10.1	8.7	4.5	1.2	2.0		
Centre	19.7	13.1	13.4	13.6	12.0	11.8	12.4	11.0		
Bavarian People's.....		4.4	3.2	3.7	3.1	3.0	3.6			
Democratic	18.5	8.4	5.7	6.3	4.9	3.8	0.7			
Social Democratic.....	37.9	22.1	20.5	26.0	29.8	24.5	21.9	20.7		
Independent Social Democratic	7.6	18.0								
Communists		2.0	12.6	9.0	10.6	13.1	14.7	17.1		
Others	0.7	2.1	5.0	2.8	7.0	3.8	0.4			

for Germany's entrance into the League of Nations. Concerning this period, Professor Gooch has

written: "The happiest time began when Streseman, the outstanding figure of the Weimar era, took the helm in the autumn of 1923 and directed foreign policy for the next six years. A new currency was introduced and kept its value; the French withdrew from the Ruhr; Poincaré's Block National was defeated; the reparation problem was regulated by the Dawes plan; the Locarno Agreement, at the suggestion of Streseman himself, accepted the new Franco-German frontier as final; Germany entered the League of Nations; the Kellogg Pact renounced war as an instrument of national policy. It was the period of recovery. When Streseman died of overwork in the autumn of 1929, *Germany was on friendly terms with every country in Europe . . .* The Weimar Republic was unwittingly destroyed by American speculators. The economic blizzard crossed the Atlantic and burst on Europe in 1930. In Germany the number of unemployed doubled, banks collapsed, old firms shut their doors. At the General Election in September the Nazis jumped from 12 to 107. . . . Four factors prepared the Nazi victory—the defeat in the world war, the severity of Versailles, the American slump, and the magic of Hitler."²⁸³

There is strong reason to believe that the German Republic would have survived if the Allies had taken advantage of the situation during the period of economic recovery and the period of Locarno which coincided by carrying out their oft-repeated promises to reduce armaments. If the World Disarmament Conference had been a dramatic success, the parties of conciliation and co-operation in Germany would have been strengthened enormously and the Nazis would have been

correspondingly weakened. Never let the fact be forgotten that it was the failure of that conference, and Germany's withdrawal from it, that proved to be the decisive factor in Hitler's appeal to the German voters.

In discussing the manifesto in which Hitler set forth his reasons for withdrawal from the World Disarmament Conference and from the League of Nations, Lloyd George wrote: "Hitler would never have been there to issue his manifesto in the name of the German nation had it not been for the outrageous breach of faith perpetrated by the nations that ruled the League. He is giving dramatic expression to the indignation of every honest man in Germany at the shameless and elaborate trickery and treachery perpetuated upon his great country."²³⁴

Prophetic were these words written in a British periodical in 1931; "When the history of the last twelve years is written we shall see that the central tragedy has been the failure to make use of the pacific mood of post-war Germany. For years after the war Germany was not only disarmed, but she did not want to re-arm. The Hohenzollerns, the Junkers, the whole paraphernalia of Prussian militarism, were utterly discredited, and if the Allies had made a different use of their victory, the endless chain of Franco-German hostility—war, revenge, and revenge again—would have been broken."²³⁵

Dr. Arnold Wolfers, Director of Studies, Deutsche Hochschule für Politik in Berlin, made a notable address before the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London on November 19, 1929. Dr. Wolfers was at that time a citizen of Switzer-

land, and is now a professor in Yale University. He has long been recognized as one of the most discerning interpreters of political life in Germany, and therefore these words become all the more impressive: "It is a significant fact that Germany, after having lost the war, re-entered European politics with a spirit of hope, and of very grave illusions . . . The Social-Democrats, and the other Democratic groups had done away with an autocratic regime: they had changed the Constitution, in the most complete way; they had established the German Republic . . . The other nations, however, remained hostile to Germany in the first years, with the result that a spirit of despair, of disillusionment and disappointment took hold of the German people." Professor Wolfers continues with this comment about the second period of hope: "Events have since proved that with the Locarno Treaty the European situation became completely different from what it was before . . . Germany once again felt that she was becoming an equal Power among the family of nations."²³⁶

At the end of 1930 a British journal pointed out that "the forces and tendencies that make for pacification and the reverse are in so many countries so evenly balanced, and are so closely dependent upon movements in other countries, that a single event will often change the whole equilibrium."²³⁷ That the Allies could have changed the equilibrium in ways that would have preserved the German Republic and thereby reduced enormously the likelihood of war is supported by cumulative and convincing evidence.

During the recent war it became the fashion to maintain that democracy in Germany was doomed

from the beginning because of strong disinclination and inherent ability of the German people to operate the processes of democracy. Countless times the statement was reiterated that the Germans are by temperament docile and subservient, with a natural tendency to accept domination, either from an Emperor or from a Fascist dictator. This idea has been considered in detail by a competent writer, Arnold Brecht, in a recent volume published by Oxford University Press.²³⁸ In a chapter entitled, "Have the Germans Always Been Totalitarian?" the author analyzed the figures in German elections since 1871. In the last election to the Imperial Reichstag held in 1912 on the eve of the First World War, the Social Democrats elected 110 members, the largest number of any party, the Catholic Center 91, and the Left Liberals 42, a total for these three groups of 243 out of the 397 members of the Reichstag. The fact that these parties supported the German Government in waging the war is no more proof of their incompetence to operate parliamentary government than did the parallel support of the war by French and British Socialist and Liberal parties constitute proof of similar inability in those lands. The Germans were late in achieving political unity and their inherited monarchy had reduced their opportunities for experience in administering parliamentary power, but as early as 1898 every fourth voter in Germany had supported the Social Democrats, and by 1912 this proportion had grown to one in three.

Down to the last free election in November, 1932, the aggregate of Social Democratic and Communist votes was always in excess of one-

third of the total, but never as much as one-half. To these votes must be added those of the other anti-totalitarian parties, the Center Party and the Bavarian People's Party. As long as there were free elections in Germany these four parties always polled more than half of the votes cast.

The kind of arguments used to prove that the Germans do not want democracy and are inherently unable to operate its processes may well be used to prove that the American people do not want democracy and cannot operate it effectively: the small proportion of citizens who vote regularly in primaries and regular elections; the high proportion of citizens who vote the straight ticket; the small proportion of citizens who ever attend a precinct meeting or participate actively in political affairs; the high extent of blind allegiance to favorite political leaders, the low degree of public spirit and the high extent of graft and corruption in politics. Indeed, some of these characteristics were less prevalent in Germany than in the United States.

The collapse of the German Republic was due in part to the docile nature of many Germans and to their tendency to "let the government do it." But infinitely more its collapse was due to a vast complexity of economic, psychological and political factors. The balance could have been tipped in favor of the Republic by the Allies if they had resolutely sought to lift up the Germans and steady them on their feet by a policy of mutual aid, mutual confidence, and mutual responsibility. Hitler precipitated the war, but the Allies helped mightily in lifting Hitler to power.

Imagination is stirred by reflection upon the

vast change in the course of history which might have been wrought if the Allies had taken seriously the words of the sleeping Clemenceau: "*We the weaker, have got them down; we, the conquerors, will lift them up.*"

CHAPTER VI

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN
THE PACIFIC

The attack at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, was a vicious act of aggression on the part of the military and naval groups then controlling the government of Japan. This murderous assault leaves an indelible blot on Japan's record, and the passing of time will not erase it.

If this generation of Americans is to play an effective role in the prevention of a third world war, there must be a rapid increase in the number of citizens who have achieved historical perspective and who understand the nature of this aggression and the reasons for it. This requires study of the record of the Western nations in China, Korea, and other areas of the Far East.

Japan's actions must be viewed in the light of the behavior of other imperialist powers on the world scene during the past century. The discovery of numerous precedents for Japan's conduct will not serve as a justification for her crimes, but will shed light on the reasons for her vicious aggression. The future policy of the United States in relation to Japan will be vitally affected by clearer understanding.

*1. The Record of the European Powers in the
Far East.*

High mountains and wide seas and immense distances separate China from the West. Even higher barriers were long maintained in the attitude of arrogance and the practice of seclusion. For three hundred years after the arrival of the

first modern Europeans in China, the officials of that ancient country attempted to stop the ever-increasing flow of foreigners—first the Portuguese and Spanish and Dutch, and then the British, Americans, French, Germans, and Russians. Seclusion and exclusion were the two sides of a determined policy. As late as the first decades of the nineteenth century, the officials and the people of China were almost totally ignorant of life in the West. Scholarship was directed to eulogies of the ancient glories of China and the nation was taught to look backward. National arrogance was the natural product of the deep feeling of superiority over all other peoples. The Chinese despised foreigners and felt no need for anything that they could bring. Passionately they desired to be left alone and undisturbed.

It was in 1793 that the Chinese emperor Ch'ien Lung sent a "mandate" to King George III of England, in which he said: "You, O King, live beyond the confines of many seas. Nevertheless, impelled by your humble desire to partake of the benefits of our civilization, you have despatched a mission respectfully bearing your memorial . . . If I have commanded that the tribute offerings sent by you, O King, are to be accepted, this was solely in consideration for the spirit which prompted you to despatch them from afar. Our dynasty's majestic virtue has penetrated unto every country under Heaven, and Kings of all nations have offered their costly tribute by land and sea . . . We possess all things. I set no value on objects strange and ingenious, and have no use for your country's manufacture. Our dynasty, swaying the myriad races of the globe, extends the same benevolence

towards all . . . I do not forget the lonely remoteness of your island, cut off from the world by interviewing wastes of sea, nor do I overlook your excusable ignorance of the usages of our Celestial Empire . . . Upon you who live in a remote and inaccessible region, far across the spaces of the ocean, but who have shown your submissive loyalty by sending their tribute mission, I have heaped benefits far in excess of those accorded to other nations. But the demands presented by your Embassy are not only a contravention of dynastic tradition, but would be utterly unproductive of good results to yourself, besides being impracticable . . . Should your vessels touch the shore (at other places than Canton, where trade was permitted), your merchants will assuredly never be permitted to land or to reside there, but will be subject to instant expulsion . . . Tremble and obey and show no negligence."

This determination to exclude foreigners who came to trade was intensified by the low estimate in which their own merchants were held by Chinese officials. First rank was assigned to scholars, and from this class public officials were chosen. Farmers were accorded second rank, artisans third, merchants fourth, soldiers fifth. A foreign trader was looked upon as an inferior and degraded being who would be ignored or treated with contempt. The continuance of this feeling for three centuries after the first Portuguese trader arrived in 1516 made it impossible for the Chinese government to establish cordial relations with Western powers. Experience deepened the conviction of Chinese officials that "the barbarians are like beasts, and not to be ruled on the same principles

as Chinese. Were one to attempt controlling them by the great maxims of reason, it would tend to nothing but the greatest confusion. The ancient sovereigns well understood this, and accordingly ruled barbarians by misrule. To rule barbarians by misrule is the true and best way of ruling them."

China's arrogant desire to be left alone by despised foreigners was met by domineering insistence on the part of Western nations that the Celestial Kingdom should be opened to their traders and diplomats and missionaries. Cash and converts were the driving dynamics of the representatives of the West. They insisted upon access to China so that they might make profits and disciples. They looked upon the Chinese as heathen and inferior. In the seventeenth, eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the prevailing attitude throughout Christendom was that heathens possessed no rights which Christians were bound to respect. In the name of Christ, Spanish adventurers in South America seized the land and property of "natives" without the slightest twinge of conscience. In the seventeenth century, King Charles I of England issued a commission to William Cobb, an English sea captain, "to make prize of" any belongings of infidels in the Far East. This meant, as a recent writer points out, that Captain Cobb "had the king's full sanction for indulging in what we today would call outright piracy against all non-Christians. That seems somewhat startling, today. But King Charles and Captain Cobb probably would have been amazed if anyone had questioned the propriety of that commission. The king authorized the captain to do more than everyone else was

doing—and had been doing for a century and more—in the Americas as well as in the East . . . The Europeans took goods and territory in the East, in exactly the same spirit that they did in the Americas. Cortez and his crew were not, in European eyes, pirates or bandits when they looted Montezuma's palaces and slaughtered the Mexicans—any more than the English and French who plundered and killed in India were unprincipled and ruthless robbers. Instead, those who robbed the heathen were thought of as highly moral people, engaged in the praiseworthy occupation of injuring God's enemies, and adding glory and riches to their sovereigns."²³⁹ Our own American forefathers as they pushed the frontier westward had little conscience about plundering and robbing and killing the "savages."

In the seventeenth century the Dutch brought tobacco from Java to China, and in order to make smoking more attractive they mixed opium with it. Large numbers of Chinese were soon smoking opium without the tobacco, thus creating an ever-expanding market for the drug. The Chinese government, beginning in 1796, issued edicts against its importation and use. The difficulty of enforcing these laws was increased by the attitude of foreign governments in supporting the right of their traders to sell opium. In 1839 the Chinese government seized several million dollars' worth of opium near Canton, in an effort to destroy the illicit traffic in the drug. This act was regarded by the British as the culmination of a long series of affronts, abuses and injustices, and was a primary factor in the outbreak of war which has come to be known in history as The Opium War. In refer-

ring to this war, Gladstone said: "A war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know and have not read of. The British flag is hoisted to protect an infamous traffic."

After the conclusion of the war, the British government made repeated efforts to legalize the traffic in opium and finally the impotent Chinese authorities were forced to yield to this foreign pressure to impose the drug traffic upon the Chinese people. The chief British argument throughout was that, while they themselves were opposed to the traffic in drugs, if they did not make the sales the traders of other nations would do so, and that it was better for the profits to go to the British than to their competitors. In addition to the indemnity of six million dollars for the seized opium, the British received a further indemnity of twelve million dollars to pay costs of the Opium War, and three millions due British merchants from bankrupt Chinese firms. Furthermore, Great Britain forced China to cede the island of Hongkong outright, and to open Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo and Shanghai as treaty ports in which British subjects could reside and engage in business. So the British were well compensated for the seizure of their illegal opium by the Chinese government engaged in the enforcement of its own laws.

Furthermore, China was deprived of the right to establish her own tariff rates, being compelled to sign a treaty in which arbitrary tariff schedules were fixed. "Thus in the days of China's ignorance of international practices," wrote Professor Williams in 1928, "there was imposed upon her, as the result of a war in which she had been humiliated, a

treaty tariff, which was in violation of her sovereignty and which, by reason of the duties levied, has interfered seriously with her revenue and which today gravely affects the stability of her government."²⁴⁰ Subsequently, the Western powers forced China to accept the system of extraterritoriality, whereby the nations of the West established their own courts and exercised exclusive jurisdiction over their citizens in China.

China had been compelled by superior force to yield to the demands of Great Britain, but was not reconciled to the idea of unobstructed trade relations. In 1856 the British charged that disrespect had been shown to their flag and proceeded to bombard and capture Canton. Two years later the joint forces of Britain and France captured the Taku Forts and marched into Tientsin. In 1860 they seized the famous Summer Palace of the Emperor, looted and burned it, and then destroyed a number of palaces belonging to imperial princes. The ensuing treaty provided heavy indemnity for Britain and France and compelled the opening of ten new ports to foreign trade. Specific mention was made of opium as a legal article of trade.

In 1867 France forcibly annexed three provinces of Cochin China. Great Britain annexed Lower Burma in 1862, but the Burmese King continued to rule the remainder of his kingdom as a vassal of China until 1886, when a treaty with China allowed the annexation of Upper Burma also. Strangely enough, the payment of tribute to China continued until 1895. Chinese suzerainty over Nepal and Sikkim were surrendered to Great Britain in 1890. In 1898 four European powers compelled China to grant long-term leases of ports

—Kiachow Bay to Germany, Port Arthur to Russia, Kwangchow Bay to France, and Wei-hai-wei to Great Britain. These ports were obtained as naval bases and as centers of power in forcing their respective policies upon China, and as instruments in the balance-of-power struggle.

The Western powers were always able to cite provocative acts of injustice and violence on the part of the Chinese as justifications for their successive seizures of Chinese territory. The Chinese were provocative. In every conceivable way they made it plain that they did not desire the presence on their soil of these obnoxious and aggressive "foreign devils." Citizens of the Western nations were often defrauded, robbed, beaten, and not a few of them were murdered. The kettle of arrogance, resentment and hostility boiled over in the terrible Boxer massacres of 1900, when 233 missionaries and members of their families were murdered. Some were shot, some stabbed, some beheaded, and some were burned to death. Seven foreign nations furnished troops that captured Peking.

China's hostility coupled with China's weakness invited aggression on the part of the Western powers. By the opening decade of the twentieth century, France, Great Britain, Germany and Russians were striving to gain additional Chinese territory and to increase their spheres of influence. The situation was further complicated by reason of the fact that the bitter struggle of the European powers for world domination centered for a decade in China. "Here were four great European nations at daggers drawn over the moribund Chinese Empire," writes A. Whitney Griswold. "The French,

THE RECORD OF THE EUROPEAN POWERS

constantly expanding northward from Indo-China into the southern Chinese provinces of Yunnan, Kwangsi and Kwangtung, extorted railway and mining concessions from Peking at the point of the sword. The British were similarly exploiting the enormous Yangtse Valley, as the Germans were Shantung and the Russians Manchuria and Korea. The tendency of the businessmen and diplomats of each nation was, quite naturally, to seek exclusive commercial and financial privileges within their respective spheres. This was as true of the British as it was of all the others . . . ”²⁴¹

In 1925, 1926, and 1927, there were serious anti-foreign riots in Shanghai, Canton and Hankow. An anti-British boycott was maintained at the peak of intensity for many months. When the Nationalist armed forces entered Nanking in 1927 there was systematic looting of foreign houses.

The years 1516 and 1927 are separated by a span of 411 years. Throughout that entire period China and the Western powers were engaged in a continuous struggle. By superior might the armed and industrialized nations of the West imposed their policy upon the decadent giant of the East. The feeling of superiority confronted the feeling of superiority; arrogance was met with arrogance, and contempt with contempt; trickery faced treachery; violence was returned for violence. “The soldiers have committed atrocities horrible beyond description, and Ministers of their nationals are all engaged in looting . . . *Right and reason disappear, and we return to the ethics of the Dark Ages.*”²⁴² These words were written in 1901 by Alfred E. Hippisley, a longtime British resident in China. They could aptly be applied to many a

period in the four centuries of conflict between China and the West.

One of the great historians of imperialism has written: "Europe's treatment of China in the whole period from 1895 to 1900 had been devoid of all consideration and of all understanding. The Celestial Empire to them was simply a great market to be exploited to the full, *a rich territory to be carved up like a sirloin steak*. Hardly anywhere in the diplomatic correspondence does one find any appreciation for the feelings of the Oriental or any sympathy for the crude efforts made at reform. The dominant note was always that *force is the father of peace* and that the only method of treating successfully with China is the method of the mailed fist."²⁴³

2. The Aggression of Japan

Thus far no reference has been made to Japan's part in the spoilation of China. Its significance can be grasped only by seeing Japan in this setting of long-continued foreign aggression in China. An important section of a recent volume is headed: *Japan Joins the Aggressors*. This is exactly what happened. Japan the aggressor joined her fellow-aggressors in imposing her policy upon an impotent China. Japan's record is smeared with terrible blots and no recitation of the crimes of other nations can erase the evidence of her barbarous and criminal aggression. To condemn Japan is easy to do and is thoroughly justifiable, but it is more important that we understand the dynamics of her vicious behavior.

Six years before the attack at Pearl Harbor, Nathaniel Peffer wrote an illuminating and dis-

turbing book entitled, *Must We Fight in Asia?* "It is futile to understand the origin, motivation and significance of Japan's incursion into Manchuria and Mongolia since 1931 without taking into account the background of the preceding ninety years," he wrote . . . "By the last decade of the century the tide of Western imperialism was in full flood. Africa was being cut to pieces. The Near East was staked out or maneuvered over. Every island in every ocean with a trace of natural wealth was seized by force or chicane . . . China was losing its sovereignty not only as an abstract political concept . . . the life of China was organized primarily in the interests of foreigners . . . China was terrorized into submission . . . *It is a malodorous story, a story of bullying, greed and rapacity.* Judged by any code of ethics or the commonly accepted standards of conduct, it is revolting . . . It was a chapter in history, a hideous one . . . Japan's mentality, too, has been formed out of memory. Japan suffered less at the hands of the West than China, but enough to have rankled . . . Out of resentment, suspicion and distrust it has taken the premises of all its international conduct. Its acts are based on the assumption that *the West is still the marauder in the Far East* and that it must forestall the West. Unless, therefore, it conquers China itself, the Western Powers will do so . . . The basic premise of Japan's philosophy of action is that force is the sole determinant in the relations of nations, more particularly in the Far East. As an interpretation of the last hundred years the premise is unchallengeable, especially in the Far East."²⁴⁴

Japan's premise: "The West is still the ma-

rauder . . . Force is the sole determinant in the relations of nations." And this premise was derived from observation of the behavior of the Western powers. Japan the aggressor learned much from her fellow-aggressors. "Force is the father of peace and the only method of treating successfully with China is the method of the mailed fist." "Right and reason disappear, and we return to the ethics of the Dark Ages." "It is a malodorous story, a story of bullying, greed and rapacity."

Early in any discussion of Japan's aggression emphasis should be given to the fact that she was compelled by superior might to open her doors to the Western powers. For 310 years prior to the arrival of Commodore Perry in 1853, Japan had been endeavoring to exclude despised and feared foreigners. In 1543 three shipwrecked Portuguese pirates were the first modern representatives of the West to reach Japan. The three Portuguese were not only pirates, they were mutineers fleeing for their lives. Two years later another Portuguese adventurer, recently released from prison in Peking, made his way into Japan, where he was paid a handsome sum for setting up a musket factory. Another early arrival was the famous missionary St. Francis Xavier, who had been winning converts in India and Ceylon. He arrived on a pirate ship captained by Necoda the Robber. After Xavier became the instrument of the conversion of several high officials, mass conversions followed. In 1587, however, there was an edict of expulsion for all foreigners, traders and missionaries alike.

The chapter headings in a recent history of

Japan's relationships with foreigners are illuminating: "Insults and Massacres, 1611-1638." "Curb-ing the Dutchmen, 1638-1686." "Aliens Are Enemies." "Prohibiting Heresies." "The Gunboats Force Peace." From the edict of expulsion in 1587 to Commodore Perry's forcible descent in 1853, a span of 268 years, Japan was a hermit nation, excluding foreigners (except a few Dutch and Chinese,) and even banning the books of alien lands.

President Fillmore sent Commodore Perry to Japan for two primary purposes: to bring to an end the mistreatment of American seamen shipwrecked on Japanese soil, and to open that land to American trade. "When Perry's four warships steamed into Tokyo Bay, black smoke pouring from their funnels, the Japanese were terrified at the strange sight, and fled to their temples to pray for deliverance." Among the lavish presents offered were firearms, champagne and many barrels of whiskey. When the Japanese refused to negotiate a treaty, the Commodore announced that he would return next year with more warships. In 1854, Perry did return, this time with ten warships, and obtained a treaty permitting American ships to anchor in two ports, and promising hospitable treatment of shipwrecked Americans.

Before 1867 Japan was a feudal monarchy, but the Mikado or Emperor possessed little authority, actual power being wielded by the Shogun, the strongest of the nobles. The "Restoration," the return of national power to the Emperor, ended an ancient era and ushered in the modern age for Japan. Japan's leaders now turned to the West with urgent appeals to help in modernizing almost

every phase of their national life. Experts were brought in from England, France, Germany and the United States. Japanese students in great numbers swarmed to the universities of the West. Within fifty years the cleavages of the old feudalism had been cemented into the patriotic unity of a great nation state. The completeness of this transformation within so short a time is one of the marvels of history.

In two respects especially Japan imitated the Western powers, in taking over their militarism and their industrialism. In 1872 reliance upon the samurai the professional warriors was superseded by the adoption of universal military conscription along European lines. The most influential foreigner in Japan in that early period was unquestionably an American missionary, Guido Fridolin Verbeck, who reached Japan in 1859 just six years after Commodore Perry's first visit. His classes soon became famous and considerable numbers of young people from the most powerful families in the land came under his influence. When the Imperial University was established Verbeck was appointed head of the foreign department. For several years he was official adviser to the Senate. His biographer, Dr. William Elliot Griffis, himself a Professor in the Imperial University of Japan, began a chapter on "The New National Army and Navy" with these words: "The idea of a national army of soldiers, infused with loyalty to the Emperor, born into a new patriotism, educated in the public schools, and made democratic by the camaraderie of conscription, that should level all class distinctions while in the ranks, was born in the parlor of Dr. Verbeck, at

the great conclave of statesmen held in his house in July, 1870." Fateful words, these words of an influential American missionary advising Japan to adopt universal military conscription!

By 1894 Japan felt strong enough to enter the conflict for the spoilation of China, in which the Western powers had long been engaged. The natural place to begin was in Korea, a strategic area under the sovereignty of China. In less than a year, Japanese forces captured control of all Korea and southern Manchuria. In the peace treaty China recognized the independence of Korea, thus paving the way for complete Japanese domination of that land. The Island of Formosa was ceded outright to Japan, as were the Pescadores Islands. China agreed to pay an indemnity of \$150,000,000 a sum sufficient to cover Japan's war costs. The provision of the treaty by which Japan would have acquired Liaotung Peninsula, the southern tip of Manchuria, was never fulfilled because of the threatening opposition of Russia, Germany and France. Rather than risk war with these three powers, Japan abandoned temporarily any claim to territory on the Chinese mainland. This intervention which deprived Japan of valuable spoils of war became part of Japanese memory. This memory included the recollection that the intervening powers quickly claimed their respective rewards for befriending China.

During the Boxer War, Russian troops occupied parts of Manchuria. Following the war Japan protested against the continuation of this occupation and Russia promised to withdraw her armed forces from Manchuria, but the promise was not carried out. In 1902 Japan and Great Britain

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

entered into a military alliance, for the obvious purpose of preventing further encroachments by Russia. This alliance was twice renewed and extended in scope, and remained in force until 1921 when it was supplanted by the Four Power Pact signed in Washington. This alliance provided a basis of confidence for a more aggressive policy and in 1903 Japan demanded that Russian troops be withdrawn from Manchuria. When the Russians refused to give a definite answer, the Japanese opened fire on Russian warships at Port Arthur. Japan's declaration of war did not come until the following day.

Concerning this war, Professor Parker T. Moon has written: "Japan was the aggressor, on the face of the record; yet Russia was at least as much responsible. The Tsar's cabinet ministers were determined to sieze Manchuria without making any bargain with Japan. They were even endeavoring to gain concessions and political influence in Korea, which since 1895 Japan had considered as hers to exploit, reform, and protect. For Japan's imperialism in Korea little excuse can be offered, but for Japan's determination to prevent the insatiable Russian empire from seizing Korea—so close to Japan—there was good reason. And if Japan began the war, it was in part because Japanese statesmen rightly believed that Russia was simply stalling for time, until her strategic railways were completed and her Far East fleet was unimpeded by winter's ice."²⁴⁵

As a result of this spectacular and unexpected victory, Japan became entrenched in Korea and Southern Manchuria. Year after year Japan tightened her grip and in 1910 announced the outright

annexation of Korea. The alliance with Great Britain, and Japan's admission to the ranks of the Great Powers, increased her boldness and impelled her to more extreme aggression over an ever-widening area.

The outbreak of the World War in 1914 provided Japanese imperialists with a golden opportunity which they seized with enthusiasm. Japan's leaders at once perceived the advantages that would accrue by becoming a belligerent. China and Great Britain tried to keep Japan out of the war because of the obvious freedom of action which would jeopardize their interests. Quickly, however, Britain discovered that she needed Japan's assistance in destroying Germany's Asiatic squadron, and on August 7, 1914, the British Ambassador in Tokyo formally requested this aid.

By the end of 1914, Japan had driven out the Germans and was in complete control of the province of Shantung and most of the German islands north of the equator. In accomplishing this purpose Japan had violated the neutrality of China as flagrantly as the Germans had violated the neutrality of Belgium. Relentlessly taking advantage of China's impotence and the helplessness of the European powers to interfere, Japan presented to President Yuan Shih-Kai on January 18, 1915, the notorious Twenty-one Demands. Had she succeeded in obtaining all that she demanded Japan would have placed the Celestial Empire in a state of vassalage.

Before proceeding further with the story of Japan's aggression in China, our insight will be deepened by first considering the significance of the industrializing of Japan. All highly industrial-

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

ized countries require (1) access to raw materials, (2) access to markets, (3) access to foreign fields of investment of surplus savings. By 1915, Japan was rapidly becoming an industrial nation and her behavior in China was motivated by the desire to dominate the raw materials and the markets of that vast area. All the imperialist powers had long been seeking political and economic control of dependencies for the purpose of exploiting the economic resources of these dominated territories. Japan was now settling down in the ruts of a well-beaten pathway.

The population of Japan proper in 1915 was 52,752,000; as compared with 34,806,000 in 1872; 25,517,729 in 1804; and 26,065,425 in 1721. This increase of eighteen millions in 43 years was made possible by the introduction of the factory system and the rapid growth of industrialization. This huge population was crowded into the extremely limited area of 147,416 square miles of Japan proper. The State of Montana is almost exactly the size of Japan, 146,131 square miles. Comparable sizes are: California 158,297 square miles; Texas 262,398 square miles.

The density of population per square mile of arable land in different countries was as follows:²⁴⁶

Japan Proper	2,774	Germany	806
Great Britain	2,170	France	467
Belgium	1,709	State of Ohio	363
Italy	819	United States	229

Great Britain and Belgium were able to support this large population per square mile because they were highly industrialized and crowded their people in cities and industrial communities. A decent standard of living for the Japanese people

THE AGGRESSION OF JAPAN

could be achieved only by industrializing the nation. To make this possible Japan must have adequate raw materials and adequate markets. Within Japan proper there was a disastrous shortage of required raw materials, and the purchasing power of the Japanese people was too low to provide the required markets.

Japan's comparative position in relation to the production of raw materials during the period between the world wars is revealed in the accompanying tables.

SUMMARY OF RELATIVE POSITIONS

Production of 36 Raw Materials and Percentage of Total
World Production²⁴⁷


	Number of Com- modities of which Specified Nation Produced 5% and Over of Total World Production	Number of Com- modities of which Specified Nation Produced 1% to 4.99%	Number of Com- modities of which Specified Nation Produced Less Than 1%
British Empire..	24	3	9
United States.....	21	4	11
Soviet Russia.....	12	5	19
French Empire..	9	9	18
Japan	5	7	24
Italy	5	3	28
Germany	4	3	29

Even more impressive is the result revealed by an examination of the world's production of the eight most important minerals and of four other strategic raw materials: *coal, iron ore, petroleum, copper, lead, zinc, tin, bauxite, rubber, cotton, wool, raw silk*. The number of these twelve essential raw materials produced by various countries and the percentage of total world production are as follows:

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

	5% and Over	1% to 4.99%	Less than 1%
British Empire...	10	1	1
United States....	9	0	3
Soviet Russia....	3	1	8
French Empire...	2	5	5
Japan	2	3	7
Italy	1	2	9
Germany	2	3	7

Production of Essential Commodities by the Favored and the Handicapped Nations



Prepared by the author from statistical data in de Wilde, *op. cit.*, pp. 166, 167.

THE AGGRESSION OF JAPAN

The utter inadequacy of the purchasing power of the Japanese people to provide the market needed by Japanese industrialism is revealed in the following table of comparative national income in various countries:²⁴⁸

Country	Income in Respective Currencies (in millions)	Income in Millions of Dollars	Income in Yen	
			Aggregate in Millions	Per Capita in Yen
Japan	11,852 yen	5,501	11,034	178
Italy	110,038 lire	5,788	11,611	283
France	249,745 francs	9,790	19,639	477
Germany	68,505 reichsmarks	16,345	32,788	516
United Kingdom	3,500 pounds	17,032	34,166	748
United States	88,992 dollars	88,992	178,520	1,488

The relationship of industrialization to Japan's foreign policy is considered in an illuminating volume published in 1936 by Harvard University Press. In his Conclusion, the author writes: "It may be that industrialization and trade expansion will not alleviate population pressure and that territorial expansion in Asia will raise problems more serious than those for which a solution is sought. The fact remains, however, that Japan is confronted with a critical situation; so long as her statesmen and people remain convinced, as they are today, that these policies of expansion are the only practicable and logical answers to their basic problems we may expect them to act upon that conviction . . . It is well to know that there is some basis for her claims and that the expansive policies appeal to many Japanese as the only alternative to 'starving to death in their own backyards.' Only in that realization can we appreciate the motives and motivating forces of Japanese policy and pretend to know whence it moves. To cry for peace and ignore the actualities of international relations is to court disillusionment and loss of faith in the possibilities of world order."²⁴⁹

Thus we see that the dynamics of Japan's aggression included: an intense nationalism with its doctrines of national interest, national sovereignty, national honor, national patriotism; the pressure of population and the inadequacy of access to raw materials and to markets; knowledge that the Western powers had long considered the decadent Celestial Empire "a rich territory to be carved up like a sirloin steak;" an assumption that "the West is still the marauder in the Far

East;" the passion for domination and the craving for prestige.

Japan's aggression was due in considerable part to the supremacy of the military and naval authorities over the civilian government. In all the critical periods in Japan during the past fifty years, actual control has been exercised by the army and the navy. On numerous occasions the policy of the Foreign Office was nullified by the arbitrary commands of generals and admirals. A generation's experience with the processes of democratic government was not sufficient to enable Parliament to control the army and navy. For centuries the people of Japan had been intimidated and cowed by the secret police and by the armed forces. Assassination of political opponents was an instrument used by representatives of the army in forcing subordination of the government to the military authorities.

In an illuminating study entitled *Militarism in Japan*, Professor Kenneth W. Colegrove writes: "From the ninth to the nineteenth century Japan was ruled by the sword. The power of the State was the military power. The ruling classes were the military classes . . . *Bushido*, the chivalry of the Japanese feudal period, was a code of militarism. To be sure, much sentimentality developed about it, and crude brutality was largely eliminated; but at the bottom was the sword, and nothing else. *Bushido* taught that the sword of the *samurai* was his honor, which was dearer to him than his life. The sword was a symbol of God. For ten centuries the nation was engulfed in this tradition. What wonder that the Japanese today are inclined to be militaristic? . . . The unique influence of the mili-

tarists in Japan is partly sustained by the *iaku no gunmu* or supreme command. This mysterious and well-nigh sacred institution is nothing less than the absolute control of the armed forces of the Empire, which, under the constitution of 1889, is vested in the Emperor himself . . . All this means that Japan has what is called *niju seifu* or dual government. To be precise, the command of the military forces is separated from the regulation of all other governmental matters. The ministers advise the Emperor upon civil affairs of State and are responsible for their advice. But only the military advisers are expected to counsel the Emperor upon the disposal of the army and navy. The Emperor's military camp and his civil government are thus separated by law, although unity is obtained through the Emperor. It is, of course, a curious unity, for it gives a double role to the ministers of war and the navy. Standing with one foot in the military camp and the other in the political arena, a soldier-politician has an unique opportunity for influencing the trend of government—an opportunity of which General Sadao Araki took full advantage during the Manchurian controversy . . . It is thus apparent that in Japan the Emperor presides over two separate governments—one being the civil government, and the other the army and navy."²⁵⁰

All this helps us to understand Japan's notorious Twenty-One Demands upon China. The situation was thus summarized by A. Whitney Griswold: "Japan had been making great strides toward wealth and power since her war with Russia. But she had by no means reached the objectives the attainment of which she believed her geograph-

ical situation made imperative. The position in Korea, southern Manchuria and eastern Inner Mongolia that she had wrested from Russia and fortified with the sundry political instruments already discussed had enhanced her sense of security, yet left it far from complete. Russia herself, though bound to Japan by various treaties, was still a menace to the north. England and the United States caused her further uneasiness. The Knox neutralization scheme and the Chinshow-Aigun project had threatened the foundations of her special position north of the Great Wall. South of it, in China proper, she had experienced the same difficulty in forcing her way into the thicket of European rights and privileges as had the United States. She had not the financial resources to compete on equal terms with Germany, France, England and the United States . . . In China proper lay the raw materials and natural resources which, for Europe, were profitable speculations, but for Japan were the lifeblood of existence. The European spheres of economic interest all carried with them political influence at Peking . . . Yet Japan had not been able to make any loans or build any railways south of the Great Wall. Her position there was inferior to that of any of the Great Powers, and what is more, dependent on their whims. She had not attained her goal; she was fearful of losing what she had, and this because of the competitive imperialism of Western nations, thousands of miles away, to which China was of infinitely less political and economic significance than to Japan. Now that these Western nations were preoccupied with the war, Japan would adjust the situation. Since 1895, when France, Rus-

sia and Germany had forced her to return the Liaotung Peninsula to China, Western interventionists had repeatedly thwarted Japan in her pursuit of what, to her, was not only a just but a vitally essential policy. This time she would profit by experience. She would strengthen her foothold in Manchuria and Mongolia, and make that in Shantung secure enough to withstand another Triple intervention. She would establish access to China's raw materials, to the financial, industrial and commercial privileges which she considered indispensable to her existence as a modern industrialized state, and for which she had been too poor, financially, to compete with Europe. Because she had not been able to accomplish these ends by economic means, she would do so by political. Finally, she would make the contract so binding that it could not be broken on European council tables once the war freed Europe's attention. Such, briefly, was the origin of the Twenty-One Demands."²⁵¹

Included in the Twenty-One Demands were these: China's consent in advance to any agreement with Germany about her rights in Shantung and Kiaochow Bay; Japan's right to open mines in South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, and the right to purchase land and to an option on all railway construction and loans; ninety-nine-year leases on Port Arthur and Dalny; the transformation of the great Chinese iron and steel concern into a "joint concern of the two nations;" concessions to build railways in the British shere of influence; the employment of Japanese "advisers" to supervise "political, financial and military affairs;" the establishment of a joint Sino-

Japanese police force; the recognition of Fukien province as a Japanese sphere of influence.

These demands went far beyond any claims ever made upon China by the Western powers. If they were accepted, wrote Professor Parker T. Moon, "China would be a Japanese Egypt." Perhaps we might say, a Japanese India. Sixteen of the twenty-one were actually forced upon China, and the other five were never deleted from Japanese policy. In 1931 Japan seized control of Mukden and quickly entrenched herself in all Manchuria. Within a year the puppet state of Manchoukuo was set up, under the absolute domination of Japan. In 1933 Japan resigned from the League of Nations, and the next year gave notice that she would not renew the naval limitation treaty. Soon her conquest was extended to Jehol, Chahar and the eastern districts of North China. Japanese garrisons in Tientsin and Peiping were substantially strengthened. An incident at Lukoukiao Bridge near Peiping on July 7, 1937, precipitated the undeclared war with China which continued for eight years until the final surrender of Japan to the United States. On December 13, 1937, Nanking was captured, looted and burned. Unspeakable outrages occurred on a vast scale. Thousands of women were violated and bestiality ran riot. Throughout the occupied territory the smoking of opium by the Chinese was deliberately stimulated to the enrichment of Japanese smugglers and traders. The American gunboat *Panay* was sunk in the Yangtze River. Vast sections of China quickly came under Japanese armed occupation. In 1940 Japan invaded Indo-China, and in that year she formed a military alliance with Germany and

Italy, entering the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis.

This skeleton outline of Japan's expansion produces only a feeble impression of the ruthlessness of her aggression. The extreme militarists in control at Tokyo were determined to establish and maintain absolute mastery of China and other extended areas in the Far East. Political opponents had been silenced, intimidated, assassinated. The Emperor himself was completely under the influence and domination of the generals and admirals. Callousness, cruelty, barbarity characterized militarized Japan's policy as she extended her imperial sway. "Right and reason disappear, and we return to the ethics of the Dark Ages." "China is a rich territory to be carved up like a sirloin steak." "Force is the father of peace and the only method of treating successfully with China is the method of the mailed fist." "Military leaders who control the destiny of Japan today do not understand the language of principles, treaties and ideas . . . They proclaim them outmoded in a world which is being recast by force. They look upon them as symbols of a 'decaying democracy' for which they have no use. The only language they understand is that of force—conquest, combinations of force, and the prospects of victory or defeat."²⁵² "It is a malodorous story, a story of bullying, greed and rapacity."

The sowing has been going on generation after generation—by the Portuguese, the Spanish, the Dutch, the British, the French, the Americans, the Germans, the Russians, the Japanese—and now the terrible harvest is being gathered. There is a moral order of the universe. Reaping does come from sowing.

3. *The Record of the United States in the Far East.*

The first Americans in the Far East went there to trade. When John Ledyard returned to Connecticut in 1781 from a five-year voyage to China, he reported that he had seen fur skins sold for \$100 in Canton which had cost only a sixpence on the Northwest coast of America. For the next half century many Americans believed that fabulous fortunes could be made in the China trade.

From these early days onward the foreign policy of the United States in China has been rooted in the demand for most-favored-nation treatment, that is, for opportunities and privileges equal to those enjoyed by the nation to which most advantages had been extended by the Chinese government. The Open Door Policy was an effort to obtain equal privileges. The door could be kept open only by maintaining the independence and integrity of China, because partitioning meant exclusion from equal advantages in territories controlled by other Western Powers. These simple ideas have been the driving power behind American foreign policy through all these years.

Because many of the privileges enjoyed by Western nations were obtained by threats, intimidations and victories in war, and because the United States always claimed most-favored-nation treatment, America was the constant beneficiary of the violent and ruthless policies of European imperialist powers. Representatives of this country vigorously condemned the spoilation of China by competing nations, and then insisted upon sharing the advantages derived from their aggression.

All Americans in China have agreed that most-favored-nation treatment should be sought, but

they have differed in judgment concerning methods of accomplishing this end. The predominant sentiment has supported the policy of cooperation with Chinese authorities and opposition to partitioning by foreign powers. But there have been influential spokesmen who advocated the acquisition of Chinese territory as centers of our trade and activities in the Far East. Commodore Perry belonged to the school of thought that advocated territorial acquisition. He would begin with Formosa, Bonin Islands and Great Lew Chew, and then extend "national friendship and protection" to Siam, Cambodia, Cochin China, parts of Borneo and Sumatra, and many islands of the eastern archipelago. As a matter of fact an American firm, Robinet and Nye, obtained a foothold in Formosa and the American flag flew over the entrance to the harbor of Takow for a year. In 1862 Townsend Harris, American Consul General in Japan, advised the State Department to purchase Formosa. Five years later Rear Admiral Bell conducted a punitive expedition against the primitive peoples of Formosa with two United States warships. This punitive expedition was cited later by the Japanese as a precedent for their own armed intervention in Formosa. Throughout the century there were isolated instances of armed intervention by the United States in the Far East, but the prevailing policy was cooperation with the Chinese and opposition to the partitioning of China. Ever since 1858 American gunboats had been patrolling Chinese rivers. This also was part of the memory of the Japanese.

Hawaii was the first territory outside of the American continent to be annexed by the United States. This annexation came about as the result

of a revolution fomented by American citizens in the islands, with the vigorous assistance of the United States Minister to Hawaii, John L. Stevens. Leading foreigners in the community organized a Committee of Public Safety and on January 16, 1893, called on the American Minister for aid. "Stevens at once asked the U. S. warship *Boston* to land marines. With the marines to hold off any native opposition, the Committee took possession of the government buildings and treasury, proclaimed the end of the Hawaiian monarchy, organized a Provisional Government headed by Americans, and received Stevens' blessing—immediate *de facto* recognition."²⁵³

President Harrison had a treaty of annexation submitted to the Senate only two weeks before his term of office expired. President Cleveland, however, was vigorously opposed to expansion of our territory and withdrew the treaty. His biographer tells us that "in his study of the documents, Mr. Cleveland soon became convinced that Stevens had deliberately furthered the revolution in order the sooner to make Hawaii American territory." He sent a special Commissioner, Mr. James H. Blount, to investigate conditions on the spot. In his report Blount "represented the revolution to be the result of a conspiracy managed by aliens and chiefly by Americans, and helped on by the United States minister." Concerning this report the *New York Herald* said editorially, on November 23, 1893: "No one unprejudiced can read Mr. Blount's report without the conviction that it goes into the archives of the State Department at Washington as the darkest chapter in the diplomatic annals of this country." In his Presidential Message on Decem-

ber 18, 1893, Grover Cleveland said: "The lawful government of Hawaii was overthrown without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a shot, by a process every step of which is directly traceable to and dependent for its safety upon the agency of the United States, acting through its diplomatic and naval representatives." The President sent his regret to the Queen for the "reprehensible conduct of the American minister." On February 7, 1894, the House passed resolutions 177 to 78, "condemning Mr. Stevens for illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional government of the Hawaiian Islands." On May 31st the Senate by unanimous vote declared that the Hawaiians should maintain their own government.

The Republicans bitterly resented Blount's report and the action of Cleveland, even going so far as to make an effort to impeach Blount. The whole question was a major issue in the next Presidential campaign. McKinley was elected and almost immediately introduced a new treaty of annexation, which failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority. After the outbreak of the Spanish-American war, another effort was made to pass the treaty but notwithstanding the tremendous excitement incident to the war, the necessary votes were not forthcoming. Then it was decided to accomplish the same result by passing a joint resolution. After bitter opposition, this resolution was passed on July 6, 1898. Thus Hawaii was annexed, despite the protests of Great Britain and Japan. A month after Dewey's victory at Manila Bay, McKinley remarked to Cortelyou: "We need Hawaii just as much and a good deal more than we did California. It is Manifest Destiny."

Other nations regarded the overthrow of the Queen's government by foreigners with the aid of American marines, and the consequent annexation of Hawaii by the United States, as pure, unadulterated imperialist aggression. Japan made a vigorous official protest against the annexation. The entire incident became part of the memory of the Japanese and came to be looked upon as one more precedent set by Western Powers which some day they could follow. How differently this annexation appeared to patriotic Americans and to patriotic Japanese!

And so it was with the acquisition of the Philippine Islands by the United States, as a result of the war with Spain. During the closing decades of the last century conditions in Cuba became intolerable. Spanish tyranny became unendurable. Sharp insurrections occurred in 1895. The Spanish Governor, Don Caleriano Weyler, countered with acts of extreme cruelty and ferocity. In his message of December, 1896, President Cleveland gave warning of a possible intervention unless gross abuses were removed and peace restored. On February 15, 1898, the United States battleship Maine, lying in the harbor of Havana upon a visit of courtesy, was sunk with a loss of two officers and 258 men. In 1899 Henry Cabot Lodge wrote: "The outside engine of destruction (of the Maine) was a governmental submarine mine and had been exploded without the authority or knowledge of the Spanish Government by men who wore the uniform of Spain." In 1908 Professor E. J. Benton wrote: "One thing is clear, there was no real basis in reason or fact for holding official Spain to be the deliberate perpetrator of a crime of such magni-

tude." The effect upon American public opinion was stupendous. Sensational newspapers went to extreme lengths in demanding war with Spain. The yellow press "manipulated the real news, spread unfounded reports, putting all before their readers with scare headlines." At the beginning McKinley was strongly opposed to war and exerted himself to avert it. He was greatly handicapped by the procrastination of the Spanish Government, although it was willing to go to almost any length to avoid war. Terrific pressure was brought to bear upon McKinley by the war party. At this time the Secretary of War, Russell A. Alger, said to a Senator: "I want you to advise the President to declare war. He is making a great mistake. He is in danger of ruining himself and the Republican party by standing in the way of the people's wishes. Congress will declare war in spite of him. He'll get run over and the party with him." At the very hour when it seemed that Spain would take steps leading to the independence of Cuba, McKinley yielded to public clamor and war was declared.

In an address in New York on March 8, 1904, General Woodford, who was United States Minister to Spain at the time of the negotiations, said: "The Queen Regent of Spain and the President of the United States were each and both sincerely desirous of peace. The Spanish Government steadily, courteously, but surely receded from position to position in the interest of peace until there seemed reasonable hopes of peaceful adjustment. Then came occurrences which human foresight had not foreseen and could not have foreseen. The singular and inexplicable letter from the Spanish Minister at Washington to a correspondent at Havana; the

destruction of the steamship *Maine* in the harbor of Havana, and the suggestion by the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs that the request of the Pope for an armistice was at the insistence of the American President . . . I have always believed, and now believe, but that for these things President McKinley would have achieved the desire of his heart, and would have accomplished the ultimate independence of Cuba without war."

Dr. James Ford Rhodes an outstanding American historian, says in this connection: "No one can go through carefully the diplomatic messages without thinking that up to March 31 McKinley's conduct of the affair had been faultless . . . After this date McKinley feared a rupture in his own party, and on account of that fear, had not the nerve and power to resist the pressure for war. We may rest assured that if Mark Hanna had been President there would have been no war with Spain." In 1910, John W. Foster said: "In the light of Woodford despatches, we must conclude that had President McKinley displayed the same firmness as Grant and Cleveland, and continued to 'keep hold of the reins of diplomacy,' the Spanish War with its long train of consequences might never have come upon us." Woodrow Wilson speaks of the Spanish American War as "a war of impulse." Professor E. J. Benton says: "Except for an uncontrollable desire for war on the part of the United States, diplomacy might, within all human probability, have accomplished the emancipation of Cuba . . . In the opinion of nearly all writers on international law, the particular form of intervention in 1898 was unfortunate, irregular, precipitate and unjust to Spain. The same ends—

peace in Cuba and justice to all people concerned—in themselves good, could have been achieved by peaceful means safer for the wider interests of humanity.”

The war lasted less than four months. The American military and naval forces were soon masters of Cuba, Puerto Rico and the strategic centers of the Philippine Islands. By the treaty of peace, Spain ceded to the United States Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippine Islands, receiving a payment of \$20,000,000 for the latter. Spain also relinquished all sovereignty over Cuba.

The author of a carefully documented study of the Spanish-American War thus summarizes his conclusions: “A study of the documents drives home the conviction that the war with Spain was, from the point of view of technical diplomacy, an unnecessary war. A careful study will show that Spain had, by April 10, 1898, yielded so much to the requests of the United States as to the direction of affairs in Cuba, that, given time and patience, the practical independence of Cuba could have been secured without recourse to war. On the other hand it is difficult to see how the war could have been prevented. The diplomats might have arrived at a peaceful solution of the Cuban question; but the turgid currents of domestic politics, the enthusiasm of an awakened national consciousness, and the stirrings of humanitarian sympathy were eager for armed intervention. These were fed as well by the fact that large American property interests had suffered severely by the continued disorders in Cuba. The newspaper press of the time inflamed popular passion till almost any lie received currency.”²⁵⁴

At the beginning of the Spanish-American War nobody dreamed that the Philippine Islands would come into the possession of the United States. In his message to Congress of December, 1897, President McKinley had said: "Forcible annexation . . . cannot be thought of; that, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression." But at the end of the war we were in no mood to return them to Spain, to be subjected to further tyranny. Furthermore, we were afraid to grant them immediate independence, for fear they would fall a prey to some imperialistic power. And so an area of 115,026 square miles, embracing a population of ten million people, passed under our control.

The story of the acquisition of the Philippines by the United States has been told by a distinguished American lawyer and one-time President of the American Bar Association, Moorfield Storey, with the collaboration of Marcial P. Lichauco. "The people of the United States," they wrote, "were allowed to believe that it was a piece of good fortune that Dewey's fleet was in Asiatic waters. As a matter of fact the capture of Manila had been planned long before the *Maine* was destroyed and the Spanish war begun . . . When the possibility of war with Spain became generally accepted, Admiral Dewey was in the Gulf of California in command of the *Narragansett*. As a true naval expert the thought of taking the Philippines came to him . . . This was in the fall of 1897. He thereupon sought the command of the Asiatic squadron, and with Mr. Roosevelt's aid obtained it. Thus it was that while the indignation of a sympathetic American public was daily increasing at the atrocities in Cuba, Dewey was quietly but effi-

ciently fitting his squadron, firmly determined to capture Manila. He sailed on December 7, 1897, more than two months before the destruction of the *Maine*, with the eyes of the naval authorities watching him with interest. While lying at anchor in Hongkong there was flashed to him on February 25, 1898, the following significant cable from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy:

DEWEY, Hongkong:

Order the squadron except the *Monocacy* to Hongkong. Keep full of coal. In the event of war with Spain, your duty will be to see that the Spanish squadron does not leave the Asiatic Coast, and start offensive operations in Philippine Islands. Keep *Olympia* until further orders.

(Signed) ROOSEVELT.

And yet this was six weeks before war was declared."²⁵⁵

At the peace conference, Spain was compelled to cede the Philippines to the United States, in return for a nominal purchase price of twenty million dollars. All this had been done without any consultation of the Filipinos themselves. Their territory was simply bought from their conquerors. Objection was evidenced in the form of armed opposition, and 60,000 American soldiers fought for three years before resistance was finally broken.

This also became part of the memory of the Japanese. The fighting in the Philippines was eleven thousand miles from Washington, whereas it occurred in the front yard of Japan. From the nearest Filipino soil, the tiny island of Itbayat, to the nearest Japanese soil, the small island of Koto Sho, is just one hundred miles. During the next forty years the minds of the Japanese often turned

back to the conquest of the Philippines by the United States and their thinking was different from the reflections of the Americans as they took up the White Man's Burden in the Far East.

The record of the United States in the Far East must include an account of our dealings with Orientals in this country. The extreme degree of bitterness engendered in Japan by our policy of discrimination, persecution and exclusion has for decades poisoned the relationships of the two governments. To understand their point of view we must remember that they never objected to the limitation of Japanese migration to the United States; but they have complained bitterly against the methods used and the spirit displayed in accomplishing this end. If Japan had been treated with equality and placed on a quota basis on a par with other nations, only a tiny trickle of Japanese would have entered this country, and the desired purpose of sharp limitation would have been accomplished. Equality of treatment, not a substantial flow of Japanese into this land, was all that Japan ever sought.

There were only 150 Japanese in the United States in 1880, but by 1900 the number was sufficient to alarm many citizens of California. In August, 1900, the Japanese government announced that it would no longer issue passports to laborers desiring to go to the mainland of the United States. However, the stream of Japanese from Hawaii, and graft in the passport administration, partially defeated the first Gentlemen's Agreement. By 1905 feeling in California had reached fever pitch. President Theodore Roosevelt wrote to Senator Lodge: "I am utterly disgusted at the manifesta-

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

tions which have begun to appear on the Pacific Coast . . . The California State Legislature and various other bodies have acted in the worst possible taste and in the most offensive manner to Japan."

In 1906 the Board of Education in San Francisco segregated Japanese children in the public schools, even though there were only 93 Japanese pupils in all San Francisco at that time, 25 of whom were American citizens. When news of this action reached Japan, "the more excitable newspapers expressed themselves with great bitterness, and there swept over the country a wave of resentment against what was commonly spoken of as both a treaty violation and an insult at the hands of the United States. In obvious alarm the Tokyo correspondent of the *New York Sun* wired that during his nineteen years of residence in Japan he had 'never seen the Japanese press so agitated against the Americans.' . . . The editor of the *Kokumin Simbun*, a government organ, later stated in an interview that the segregation order had come like a thunderclap out of a blue sky . . . "It was like being suddenly slapped in the face by one's best friend."²⁵⁶ A compromise solution was finally reached: the Board of Education rescinded its act of segregation, and the President obtained a strengthened Gentlemen's Agreement. Even this stringent regulation failed to satisfy inflamed sections of California, Oregon and Washington, with the result that in 1924 Congress passed the exclusion act, which practically stopped Japanese migration to the United States.

The exclusion act was looked upon as a deliberate insult by practically all Japanese. Rather

than place Japan on a quota basis and receive about 250 Japanese immigrants per year, Congress flagrantly offended a sensitive people by discrimination and exclusion. For fifty years substantial sections of the people of the United States had shown no concern for the feelings of Orientals. Time after time they had trampled rough-shod upon the sensitivities of the Chinese and the Japanese. To appreciate the significance of this arrogance and callousness, we must remember that no people on earth were more proud and sensitive than the Japanese. Nowhere was nationalism more dominant, and nowhere was the sense of national pride more extreme. All this cumulation of discrimination, insult, and exclusion went into Japan's store of memories.

The record of the United States plus the record of the other Western Powers in the Far East must be kept in mind if we are to understand the behavior of the Japanese. In 1935 Nathaniel Peffer wrote: "Occidental diplomatic shortsightedness, fidelity to the creed of imperialism and political and economic greed were God's gifts to the Japanese General Staff. They were more. They were the buttress of the war system in the Far East. What happened after 1931 followed as a step in a geometric theorem."²⁵⁷ In the Preface to his 725-page volume, *Americans in Eastern Asia*, published in 1922, Tyler Dennett wrote: "At the risk of incurring the dislike which attaches to all iconoclasts, the writer has aimed to record the facts as they are, mindful that they do not lead to verdicts which have long been accepted. The exultant, complacent booster of his nation's virtue, whatever the nation, will not find this a satisfying source-book,

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

not if he reads it through to the end. No nation, either of the East or West, has escaped the valid charge of bad faith. *The guilt of all parties being clearly proven it was profitless to continue the discussion of guilt with a view to determining the relative degrees of wickedness.* Each nation, the United States not excepted, has made its contribution to the welter of evil which now comprises the Far Eastern Question. We shall all do well to drop for all time the pose of self-righteousness and injured innocence and penitently face the facts."²⁵⁸

One aspect of the record of the United States deserves especial emphasis, namely, the long established practice of armed intervention in the affairs of other nations. Fortunately, the evidence has recently been assembled in an exhaustive study by James Grafton Rogers, former Assistant Secretary of State. Since the formation of the Federal Union, the United States has engaged in five officially declared wars: War of 1812 against England, War of 1846-48 against Mexico, War of 1898 against Spain, First World War, World War II. In addition, Dr. Rogers lists *144 instances of undeclared war, armed hostilities or armed occupation*, as follows: ²⁵⁹

Year	Place	Year	Place
1798-1800	Naval war with France	1817	Amelia Island
1801-1805	Tripoli	1818	Oregon
1806	Mexico	1820-1823	Africa
1806-1810	Gulf of Mexico	1821-1822	Cuba
1810	West Florida (Spain)	1823	Cuba
1812	Florida (Spain)	1824	Cuba
1813	West Florida (Spain)	1824	Puerto Rico
1813-1814	Marquesas Islands	1825	Cuban Keys
1814-1816	Florida (Spain)	1827	Greece
1814-1825	Caribbean	1831-1832	Falkland Islands
1815	Algiers	1832	Sumatra
1815	Tripoli	1833	Argentina
1816-1818	Florida (Spain)	1835-1836	Peru

THE RECORD OF THE UNITED STATES

Year	Place	Year	Place
1836	Mexico	1889	Hawaiien Islands
1838-1839	Sumatra	1890	Argentina
1840	Fiji Island	1891	Chile
1841	Drummond Island	1891	Bering Sea
1841	Samoa	1891	Navassa Island
1842	Mexico	1893	Hawaii
1843	West Africa	1893-1894	Brazil
1844	Mexico	1894	Nicaraugua
1849	Smyrna	1894	Korea
1851	Turkey	1894-1895	China
1851	Johanna Island	1894-1895	China
1852-1853	Argentina	1895	Colombia
1853-1854	Japan	1896	Nicaraugua
1853-1854	Ryukyu and Bonin Isl.	1898	Nicaraugua
1853-1854	Nicaraugua	1898-1899	China
1854	China	1899	Nicaraugua
1855	Fiji Islands	1899	Samoa
1855	Uruguay	1899-1901	Philippine Islands
1855	China	1900-1901	China
1856	Colombia	1901	Colombia
1856	China	1902	Colombia
1857	Nicaraugua	1903	Honduras
1858	Uruguay	1903	Dominican Republic
1858	Fiji Islands	1903-1904	Turkey
1858-1859	Turkey	1903-1904	Abyssinia
1859	Paraguay	1903-1904	Colombia-Panama
1859	China	1904	Dominican Republic
1859	Mexico	1904	Tangier, Morocco
1860	West Africa	1904	Panama
1860	Colombia	1904-1905	Korea
1862	Slave Trade	1906-1909	Cuba
1863	Japan	1907	Honduras
1864	Japan	1910	Nicaraugua
1865	Colombia	1910-1911	Honduras
1866	Mexico	1911	China
1866	China	1912	Honduras
1867	Formosa	1912	Cuba
1868	Uruguay	1912	Panama
1868	Japan	1912	Turkey
1868	Colombia	1912-1925	Nicaraugua
1870	Hawaii	1912-1941	China
1870	Mexico	1913	Mexico
1871	Korea	1914	Haiti
1873	Colombia	1914	Dominican Republic
1873-1882	Mexico	1914	France
1874	Hawaiian Islands	1914-1917	Mexico
1876	Mexico	1915-1934	Haiti
1882	Egypt	1916-1924	Dominican Republic
1885	Colombia	1917-1919	Cuba
1888	Korea	1918-1919	Mexico
1888	Haiti	1918-1920	Soviet Russia
1888-1889	Samoa	1919	Honduras

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

1919-1920	Panama	1926-1933	Nicaragua
1920	Guatemala	1933	Cuba
1920	Soviet Russia	1940	British Bases
1921	Panama-Costa Rica	1941	Greenland
1922	Greece	1941	Dutch Guiana
1924-1925	Honduras	1941	Iceland
1925	Panama	1941	German Submarines

These undeclared wars, armed hostilities or armed occupations have taken place in about 45 different countries or islands. Mexico appears on the list 12 times, China 11, Colombia 10, Nicaragua 9, Cuba 7, Honduras 6, Panama 6, Japan 5. American armed forces have been stationed in China for the 46 years since the Boxer Rebellion and American gunboats have been patrolling the rivers of China for a very much longer time. One period of armed occupation of Nicaragua continued from 1912-1925, with the Dominican Republic occupied from 1916-24, and a period of armed occupation of Haiti from 1915-1934. Armed action occurred in every decade and the longest interval without armed action by the United States in a foreign land from 1798 to 1941 was the period of five years from 1844 to 1849.

4. The Pre-Pearl-Harbor Policy of the United States.

When the European War broke out in 1939, President Roosevelt immediately decided that Hitler must be defeated. He hoped and expected that this could be accomplished without the entrance of the United States into the armed conflict. The President, however, was determined to extend maximum aid "short-of-war" to Great Britain and her allies. In this determination he was supported

by millions of Americans who were prepared to go any length in helping to defeat Hitler and Mussolini. The dictators must be stopped at any cost, without armed participation if possible, but stopped by full participation in the war if necessary. The President was one of many millions of Americans who from the beginning were prepared to fight in all the ways required for the defeat of the Nazis. For Franklin D. Roosevelt and his supporters the only question was: *which instruments shall we use at this stage?*

Other millions of Americans were from the beginning determined to keep the United States out of the European War. Some of these were motivated by pro-fascist sympathies, while others were prompted by the conviction that it would be better for this country to stay out of the war even if this meant a risk that the dictators would win. So widespread and resolute was this determination to keep out of foreign war that Congress in 1935 adopted a stringent Neutrality Act, which in 1936 and 1937 was strengthened.

Thus the people of the United States were sharply divided in judgment, although an overwhelming majority was pro-British in sentiment. Most Americans wanted the British and the French to win, but most Americans also wanted to keep the United States out of a foreign war. Thus President Roosevelt was obliged to proceed cautiously. That is to say, he was determined to proceed, but he could only move with caution. As Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, the President wielded vast power in deciding American policy.²⁶⁰ Step by step he led the American people into the war, first into the economic war, then into the

shooting war, and finally into the declared war.

Long before December 7, 1941, the United States had entered the war, the economic war and also the shooting war. In a wartime address, Arthur Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*, said: "I am not one of those who believed that we entered the war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, but that *we were attacked at Pearl Harbor because we were already in the war.*" The attack at Pearl Harbor was made against the fleet of a belligerent which was fighting against the allies of Japan. The United States had long since ceased to be a neutral nation, and had been for many months a belligerent in the war. For this country the war did not begin on December 7, 1941, in spite of the fact that millions of Americans did not realize that long before we had already entered the war as a fighting and shooting participant. A huge majority of his fellow-citizens supported the President as he led them step by step in the waging of an undeclared war against the dictators. If the point is made that an undeclared war is not really war, the rejoinder can be made, therefore Japan was not really waging war on China during the eight years from 1937 to 1945, because neither Japan nor China ever declared war during this long and devastating conflict.

A chronological summary of events reveals clearly the steps one after the other which led the American people into an undeclared war and on to Pearl Harbor.

March 4, 1933.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States.

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

March 23, 1933.

Nineteen days later Adolf Hitler was endowed with dictatorial power over Germany.

March 27, 1933.

Four days later Japan gave notice to the League of Nations of her intention to withdraw from membership.

May 16, 1933.

President Roosevelt cabled to the heads of 55 nations an appeal for support of the coming economic and world disarmament conferences.

November 16, 1933.

The United States recognized Russia.

March 24, 1934.

The President signed the bill providing independence for the Philippine Islands, effective in 1945.

August 31, 1935.

The President signed the Neutrality Act, providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunitions, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during war.

In signing this bill, President Roosevelt said: "The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end . . . The policy of the Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of peace and the

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

avoidance of any entanglements which would lead us into conflict."²⁶²

February 29, 1936.

The Neutrality Act was extended and strengthened.

August 14, 1936.

In an address at Chautauqua, New York, the President said: "We are not isolationists except in so far as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war . . . I hate war. I have passed unnumbered hours, I shall pass unnumbered hours, thinking and planning how war may be kept from this Nation . . . if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality . . . To resist the clamor of that greed if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace . . . We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say 'no' to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war."

It is obvious from this address that the President was keenly aware of the significance of steps taken day by day.

October 31, 1936.

In a campaign address at Madison Square Garden on the eve of the national election, the President-Candidate said: "The Nation knows that I hate war, and I know that the Nation hates war.

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

I submit to you a record of peace; and on that record a well-founded expectation of future peace . . .”

November 25, 1936.

Japan and Germany sign an Anti-Comintern Pact.

May 1, 1937.

The Neutrality Act was extended and strengthened.

May 1, 1937.

President Roosevelt issues proclamation forbidding exportation of armaments to Spain. On July 17, 1936, a revolt began against Spain's Republic government, and on October 1, 1936, General Francisco Franco was proclaimed head of the Nationalist or insurgent government.

October 5, 1937.

On this day in Chicago the President delivered one of his most important addresses. Historians are generally agreed that this speech marked a turning point in the attitude of Franklin D. Roosevelt. As he moved forward from this dividing line, he became more resolutely determined that the United States should help to “quarantine the aggressors.” In this address he said: “It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease . . . the will for peace on the part of the peace-loving nations must express itself to the end that nations that may be tempted to violate their agreements and the rights of others will desist from such a course. There must be posi-

tive endeavors to preserve peace. America hates war. America hopes for peace. Therefore, America actively engages in the search for peace."

December 13, 1937.

Upon receipt of the news that the U. S. gunboat *Panay* had been sunk in the Yangtze River, President Roosevelt instructed the Secretary of State to inform the Japanese Ambassador "That the President is deeply shocked and concerned by the news of the indiscriminate bombing of American and other non-Chinese vessels on the Yangtze, and that he requests that the Emperor be so advised." The Japanese government immediately made a formal apology, offered amends, and subsequently transmitted a check for \$2,214,007.36 covering indemnification.

January 6, 1938.

The President wrote to the Speaker expressing opposition to the proposed resolution calling for a referendum vote as a prerequisite for a declaration of war, saying that "Such an amendment to the Constitution as that proposed would cripple any President in his conduct of our foreign relations, and it would encourage other nations to believe that they could violate American rights with impunity."

January 28, 1938.

President Roosevelt recommended to Congress increased appropriations for national defense, saying: "Adequate defense means that for the protection not only of our coasts but also of our communities far moved from the coast, we must keep any potential enemy many hundred miles away from our continental limits."

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

March 16, 1938.

Hitler proclaimed a German protectorate over Czechoslovakia.

August 18, 1938.

In an address at Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, President Roosevelt said: "The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British Empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other Empire."

April 21, 1938.

At a special press conference with the members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the President discussed, among other subjects, his failure to apply the Neutrality Act to the situation in the Far East. It should be recalled that this act was mandatory: "Whenever the President shall find that there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more foreign states, the President shall proclaim such fact, and it shall thereafter be unlawful . . ." Nevertheless, the President had flatly refused to invoke the provisions of this act because he thought that such action would place severe handicaps upon China in resisting Japan's aggression. After summarizing his position to the assembled editors, President Roosevelt said: "Therefore, by virtue of this *excuse* that they are not at war—it is *only an excuse*—we are maintaining, in fact, a neutral position." This "excuse," this fiction that Japan and China were not engaged in war, was used year after year as a justification for not carrying out the plain requirements of the Neutrality Act. That the President realized that an undeclared war is nevertheless war is

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

revealed in his Annual Message to Congress, January 4, 1939, when he said: "All about us rage undeclared wars—military and economic." And in a press conference on March 7, 1939, President Roosevelt discussed undeclared wars fought by the United States, including armed action against "French privateers and French men-of-war, actual French Government vessels in the West Indies . . . There was no war declared. It was, of course, actual warfare. This business of carrying on a war without declaring a war, that we think is new, is not new. There are a lot of examples all through history."

September 29, 1938.

Appeasement at Munich.

January 4, 1939.

President Roosevelt, in his Annual Message to Congress, said: "Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods *short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words*, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people."

April 9, 1939.

As he departed from Warm Springs, the President said: "I have had a fine holiday here with you all. I'll be back in the fall if we don't have a war."

June 8, 1939.

As a means of binding more closely the English-speaking peoples, the King and Queen of Great Britain visited the United States.

July 14, 1939.

The President and the Secretary of State ap-

pealed to Congress to remove the embargo against the sale of arms from the Neutrality Act, on the ground that it operated against the peace-loving nations.

July 26, 1939.

The Secretary of State gave notice to Japan that the commercial treaty would not be renewed when it expired six months thereafter.

Concerning this action, Secretary Hull later wrote that "the treaty was a bar to the adoption of *retaliatory measures* against Japanese commerce. . . . That termination removed the legal obstacle to an embargo by the United States upon the shipment of materials to Japan."²⁶³

September 1, 1939.

On the opening day of World War II, President Roosevelt appealed to all the belligerent governments to refrain from "the ruthless bombing from the air of civilians," saying that "this form of inhuman barbarism . . . has sickened the hearts of every civilized man and woman, and has profoundly shocked the conscience of humanity."

September 3, 1939,

In his radio Fireside Chat, the President said: "*Let no man or woman thoughtlessly or falsely talk of America sending its armies to European fields . . . This nation will remain a neutral nation,* but I cannot ask that every American remain neutral in thought as well . . . I hope that the United States will keep out of this war. I believe that it will. And I give you assurance and reassurance that every effort of your Government will be directed toward that end."

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

September 5, 1939.

The President by proclamation brought into effect the Neutrality Act of 1937.

September 18, 1939.

Franklin D. Roosevelt sent a message to the President of Poland expressing regret that civilians had been bombed from the air.

September 21, 1939.

The President urged Congress to repeal the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Law, saying: "I regret that Congress passed that Act. I regret equally that I signed that Act." On November 4th President Roosevelt signed the new Neutrality Law, which no longer contained the embargo against the sale of arms to belligerents.

November 30, 1939.

Russia invaded Finland.

December 1, 1939.

The President appealed to the governments of Russia and Finland to desist from the bombing of civilians.

December 2, 1939.

President Roosevelt suggested to manufacturers not to sell airplanes to belligerents who bomb civilians.

January 3, 1940.

In his Annual Message to Congress, the President said: "I can understand the feelings of those who warn the nation that they will never again consent to the sending of American youth to fight on the soil of Europe. But, as I remember, nobody has asked them to consent—for nobody expects such an undertaking. The overwhelming majority of our fellow citizens do not abandon in the slight-

est their hope and their expectation that the United States will not become involved in military participation in these wars."

May 11, 1940.

"When Mr. Churchill became Prime Minister, the President arranged to have a telephone connection of his own direct to No. 10 Downing Street . . . The telephone permitted the red tape and formality of the ordinary brand of diplomacy to be replaced by directness and simplicity of expression. . . . For many matters of diplomatic negotiation, the President, by use of the telephone, became his own ambassador to London." ²⁶⁴

May 11, 1940.

In a telegram to the King of Belgium, President Roosevelt said: ". . . the cruel invasion by force of arms of the independent nations of Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxemburg has shocked and angered the people of the United States . . ."

May 16, 1940.

The President requested Congress to appropriate \$896,000,000 additional for national defense.

May 26, 1940.

In a radio Fireside Chat, the President said: "We are shocked by the almost incredible eyewitness stories that come to us of what is happening at this moment to the civilian populations of Norway and Holland and Belgium and Luxemburg and France. . . . At this time, when the world—and the world includes our own American Hemisphere—is threatened by forces of destruction, it is my resolve and yours to build up our armed defenses."

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

June 3, 1940.

General Marshall approved the turning over to Great Britain of a supply of ordnance and munitions stocks. Concerning this transaction Edward R. Stettinius wrote: "The first detachment of the survivors of Dunkirk came ashore at Dover on May 29th, 1940 . . . An urgent message came to the President from Prime Minister Winston Churchill . . . It took less than 48 hours to decide what the Army could turn over as a reasonable risk in view of the vital importance to America's defense that Britain hold out. The first list included 500,000 *Enfield rifles* . . . It included nine hundred 75 mm. field guns, 80,000 machine guns, 130,000,000 rounds of ammunition for the rifles, 1,000,000 rounds for the 75's, an assortment of bombs, and small quantities of TNT and smokeless powder. Later in the summer *another 250,000 rifles* and additional equipment were added."²⁶⁵

August 27, 1940.

The President approved an act of Congress authorizing him to draft into active military service any members of the reserve forces and the retired personnel, a provision being inserted that these reserves could be used only in the Western Hemisphere and in the territories and possessions of the United States, and in the Philippine Islands.

June 15, 1940.

In reply to an urgent appeal from the Premier of France, President Roosevelt cabled: "I wish also to reiterate in the most emphatic terms that, making every possible effort under present conditions, the Government of the United States has made it possible for the Allied armies to obtain

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

during the weeks that have just passed airplanes, artillery and munitions of many kinds and that this Government so long as the Allied Governments continue to resist will redouble its efforts in this direction."

June 28, 1940.

In a memorandum by the Secretary of State concerning a conversation with the British Ambassador and the Australian Minister, Secretary Hull wrote: "I said that *this country had been progressively bringing economic pressure to bear on Japan since last summer, now a year*, and I enumerated the different steps and methods, which are familiar to all, and added that our fleet is now somewhere in the Pacific near Hawaii. I said that we have and are doing everything possible short of a serious risk of actual military hostilities to keep the Japanese situation stabilized . . . "266

June, 1940.

The Army Report on Pearl Harbor, Section 7, says: "It was in the fall of 1940 that we cast the die and adopted economic sanctions. And we find it significant that about June, 1940, General Herron as Commanding General of the Hawaiian Department upon Washington orders *went into all-out alert positions with live ammunition for six weeks.*"

July 10, 1940.

In an appeal to Congress for additional funds for national defense, the President said: "That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American, but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in war of aggression; *we will not send our men to take part in European*

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

wars. But, we will repel aggression against the United States or the Western Hemisphere.”

July 29, 1940.

The President requested Congress to authorize him to call out the National Guard. This action was taken and the first units of the National Guard were called out on August 31, 1940.

August 18, 1940.

President Roosevelt announced the establishment of a Joint Board on Defense of Canada and the United States, as the result of conversations with Canadian officials.

September 3, 1940.

The President informed Congress of *the exchange of 50 U. S. destroyers for certain British naval and air bases*. The right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda are gifts from Great Britain. The right to lease naval and air bases in the Bahama Islands, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, Antigua, and in British Guiana was acquired by exchanging 50 old destroyers. Subsequently the President wrote: “The announcement by me, in September of 1940, of this transfer of our destroyers in exchange for these bases was received with almost overwhelming approval by the American public. This shows how quickly the American people had come to realize not only the danger which confronted this hemisphere in the shape of physical attack from abroad, but also *the necessity of extending all possible aid to Great Britain* as a means of helping her stand off the aggressors and provide adequate time for our own rearmament.”²⁶⁷

Concerning this transaction, Davis and Lindley

wrote: "No one could doubt that the transfer of fifty naval vessels from a country at peace to a belligerent cracked, if it did not wholly fracture, our neutrality . . . The United States, one could not doubt, was now set on a course of open collaboration with wartime England."²⁶⁸

September 16, 1940.

Congress enacted the Selective Training and Service Act, calling for compulsory military training and service for men between the ages of 21 and 36.

September 27, 1940.

A pact signed in Berlin established the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis.

October 8, 1940.

At a luncheon, President Roosevelt expressed the conviction to Admiral Richardson, Chief of Staff of the Pacific Command, that the Japanese "could not always avoid making mistakes and that as the war continued and the area of operations expanded, sooner or later they would make a mistake and we would enter the war."²⁶⁹

October 10, 1940.

Secretary Knox told Admiral Richardson that the President was afraid that the Japanese would take "drastic action" when Britain re-opened the Burma Road to China, and in such an event he wanted to set up a Navy patrol which would cut off all traffic between Japan and the Americas. The Admiral was "amazed."

October 12, 1940.

In an address at Dayton on Hemisphere Defense, the President said: "No combination of dictator countries of Europe and Asia will stop

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

the help we are giving to almost the last free people now fighting to hold them at bay. Our course is clear. Our decision is made. We will continue to pile up our defense and our armaments. *We will continue to help those who resist aggression, and who now hold the aggressors far from our shores.*"

November 30, 1940.

The President announced that plans were being made to make available to China a credit of \$100,000,000.

December 5, 1940.

In a message to the King of Greece, the President said: "As your Majesty knows, it is the settled policy of the United States Government to extend aid to those governments and peoples who defend themselves against aggression. I assure Your Majesty that steps are being taken to extend such aid to Greece which is defending itself so valiantly."

December 14, 1940.

Ambassador Grew wrote to the President, addressing him: "Dear Frank: . . . About Japan and all her works. It seems to me to be increasingly clear that we are bound to have a showdown someday, and the principal question at issue is *whether it is to our advantage to have that showdown sooner or to have it later* . . . Japan has become openly and unashamedly one of the predatory nations and part of a system which aims to wreck about everything that the United States stands for . . . The principal point at issue, as I see it, is not whether we must call a halt to the Japanese program, but when. It is important constantly to bear in mind the fact that if we take measures 'short of

war' with no real intention to carry those measures to their final conclusion if necessary, such lack of intention will be all too obvious to the Japanese, who will proceed undeterred . . . Only if they become certain that we mean to fight if called upon to do so will our preliminary measures stand some chance of proving effective and of removing the necessity for war . . ."

This letter was answered on January 21, 1941, by the President, who said: "Dear Joe . . . I find myself in decided agreement with your conclusions"²⁷⁰

December 29, 1940.

In a radio Fireside Chat, President Roosevelt said: "The Nazi masters of Germany have made it clear that they intend not only to dominate all life and thought in their own country, but also to enslave the whole of Europe, and then to use the resources of Europe to dominate the rest of the world . . . If Great Britain goes down, the Axis powers will control the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and the high seas—and they will be in a position to bring enormous military and naval resources against this Hemisphere. It is no exaggeration to say that all of us, in all the Americas, would be living at the point of a gun—a gun loaded with explosive bullets, economic as well as military . . . The experience of the past two years has proven beyond doubt that no nation can appease the Nazis. No man can tame a tiger into a kitten by stroking it . . . The British people and their allies today are conducting an active war against this unholy alliance. Our own future security is greatly dependent on the outcome of that fight . . . *There is no demand for sending an Amer-*

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

ican Expeditionary Force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth . . . We are planning our own defense with the utmost urgency; and in its vast scale we must integrate the war needs of Britain and the other free nations which are resisting aggression . . . We must be the great arsenal of democracy."

January 2, 1941.

Lord Beaverbrook, British Minister of Aircraft Production, announced that American bombers were being flown across the Atlantic "in a steady stream."

January 4, 1941.

The President called out additional units of the National Guard.

January 6, 1941.

In his Annual Message to Congress, the President said: ". . . by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples, everywhere, who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our Hemisphere."

January 14, 1941.

Additional units of the National Guard were called out.

January 16, 1941.

The President requested Congress to appropriate \$350,000,000 for 200 steel cargo ships.

January 24, 1941.

The Secretary of the Navy in a letter to the

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

Secretary of War expressed the belief that "in case of war with Japan hostilities might be initiated by a surprise attack upon the Fleet or on the naval base at Pearl Harbor."²⁷¹

January 27, 1941.

Ambassador Grew reported to the Secretary of State that he had heard from many quarters that *a surprise mass attack would be made on Pearl Harbor* in the event of "trouble" between the United States and Japan.

February 9, 1941.

Prime Minister Churchill in a radio broadcast declared that Great Britain did not need American troops, but only money, ships, planes, munitions, saying: "Give us the tools and we'll finish the job."

February 16, 1941.

Harry L. Hopkins returned from Europe and reported to the President that the British were "desperately in need of help."

March 11, 1941.

The President signed the Lend-Lease Act, and on the following day requested Congress to appropriate \$7,000,000,000 to accomplish its objectives, saying: "Through this legislation, our country has determined to do its full part in *creating an adequate arsenal of democracy*. This great arsenal will be here in this country. It will be a bulwark of our own defense. It will be the source of the tools of defense for all democracies who are fighting to preserve themselves against aggression."

March 15, 1941.

At the White House Correspondents' Annual Dinner, the President said:

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

"There is no longer the slightest question or doubt that the American people recognize the extreme seriousness of the present situation. That is why they have demanded, and got, a policy of *unqualified, immediate, all-out aid for Britain, Greece, China* and for all the governments in exile whose homelands are temporarily occupied by the aggressors. From now that aid will be increased—and yet again increased—until total victory has been won . . . China likewise expressed the magnificent will of millions of plain people to resist the dismemberment of their nation. China, through the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek, asks our help. America has said that China shall have our help. Our country is going to be what our people have proclaimed it must be—the *arsenal of democracy*."

March 22, 1941.

An Executive Order established Kodiak Island Defense Area in Alaska.

March 22, 1941.

An Executive Order established Defense Area in the Philippines.

March 27, 1941.

Lieut. General Leonard T. Gerow testified before the Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee that on March 27, 1941, was held the first of "four pre-Pearl-Harbor military staff discussions among American, British Commonwealth and Dutch officers."

March, 1941.

Mr. W. A. Crumley, famous naval reporter of the *London Express* writing on April 29, 1944, of the death of Secretary Frank Knox, said: "The full extent of our debt to Colonel Knox has not

yet been disclosed but it can be said that *American warships were assisting Atlantic convoys as early as March, 1941, eight months before Pearl Harbor.*"²⁷²

Navy Order No. 190 directed the issuing of awards of ribbons to men in the Navy, Marine and Coast Guard who had been in "actual combat" with German submarines "*before December 7, 1941.*"²⁷³

April 10, 1941.

The President announced that on the previous day an agreement with Denmark had been signed whereby Greenland was brought into our system of cooperative hemispheric defense.

April 30, 1941.

President Roosevelt wrote to Rear Admiral Land, United States Maritime Commission, urging him to provide as quickly as possible 2,000,000 tons of merchant shipping.

May 1, 1941.

An Executive Order established the Guantanamo Bay Naval Defense Sea Area in Cuba.

May 6, 1941.

In a chapter on "Trucks and Planes for China," Edward Stettinius, Jr., wrote: "*For over two years, the Chinese had been buying supplies in this country with the proceeds of four Export-Import loans totaling \$120,000,000. These had been of great value, but now a far broader program of aid was under discussion. The new program was formally launched on May 6th, 1941, when the defense of China was declared vital to the defense of the United States.* . . . In May 1941, soon after China was declared eligible for Lend-Lease aid, an American Air Mission . . . was dispatched to Chungking

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

to survey the situation . . . It was . . . decided that Chinese flyers should be brought to this country for training. Lend-Lease funds were allocated for the program . . . In the Meantime General Chennault began his search for pilots and mechanics. With the help of the War and Navy Departments, which permitted some pilots then on active service to transfer to the reserve list so that they might enlist, Chennault eventually secured the services of more than 100 veteran fliers . . . On August 1st, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek issued an order formally constituting *the American Volunteer Group as a unit of China's armed forces* . . . At daybreak on December 7, 1941, the Philippine Clipper took off from Wake Island for Guam, on its way to Manila and Hong Kong. In her cargo, the big flying boat carried a large consignment of Lend-Lease spare parts anxiously awaited by General Chennault and his Flying Tigers, who were nearly ready to go into action. The Clipper had been in the air only a short time when orders were flashed over her radio to turn back."²⁷⁴

May 17, 1941.

Additional units of the National Guard were called out.

May 20, 1941.

An Executive Order established the Office of Civilian Defense.

May 27, 1941.

"Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do proclaim that *an unlimited national emergency* confronts this country, which requires that its military, naval, air and civilian defenses be put on the basis of readiness to repel any and all acts or threats of

aggression directed toward any part of the Western Hemisphere."

On the day that he issued this proclamation, the President in a world-wide radio address said: "Our Bunker Hill of tomorrow may be several thousand miles from Boston. Anyone with an atlas and a reasonable knowledge of the sudden striking force of modern war, knows that it is stupid to wait until a probable enemy has gained a foothold from which to attack. Old-fashioned common sense calls for the use of strategy which will prevent such an enemy from gaining a foothold in the first place. We have, accordingly, *extended our patrol in north and south Atlantic waters . . .* These ships and planes warn of the presence of attacking raiders, on the sea, under the sea, and above the sea . . . we shall give every possible assistance to Britain and to all who, with Britain, are resisting Hitlerism or its equivalent with force of arms. *Our patrols are helping now to insure delivery of the needed supplies to Britain. All additional measures necessary to deliver the goods will be taken. Any and all further methods or combinations of methods, which can or should be utilized, are being devised by our military and naval technicians, who, with me, will work out and put into effect such new and additional safeguards as may be needed. The delivery of needed supplies to Britain is imperative. This can be done; it must be done, it will be done.*"

May 27, 1941.

Ambassador Grew made this record in his diary: "The Minister thereupon makes perfectly clear his interpretation of the Tripartite Pact to the effect that if the United States should convoy its

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

ships to England and if Germany should sink such ships, and if war with Germany should result, he, Mr. Matsuoka, would regard the United States as an aggressor . . . ”²⁷⁵

June 1, 1941.

In a note interpreting his request on May 16, 1940, for additional appropriations, the President wrote: “*As of the present writing, June 1, 1941, the program of the United States and the British orders approximate \$40,000,000,000 for 1941 and 1942.*”

June 3, 1941.

The Coast Guard was ordered under the command of the Navy.

June 19, 1941.

In a message sent to the special convocation of the University of Oxford held at Harvard Commencement, the President said: “We, too, born to freedom and believing in freedom are willing to fight to maintain freedom. We, and all others who believe as deeply as we do, would rather die on our feet than live on our knees.”

June 20, 1941.

The President restricts the export of petroleum products.

June 20, 1941.

The President in a message to Congress considered “the sinking of the *Robin Moor*, as a warning to the United States not to resist the Nazi movement of world conquest. It is a warning that the United States may use the high seas of the world only with Nazi consent. Were we to yield on this we would inevitably submit to world domination at the hands of the present leaders of the German

Reich. We are not yielding and we do not propose to yield."

July 7, 1941.

President Roosevelt in a message to Congress explained the necessity of occupation of Iceland by the armed forces of the United States because of threats to Greenland, North Atlantic shipping and the transport of munitions to Great Britain.

Concerning the situation then prevailing, John T. Flynn subsequently wrote: "Britain had occupied Iceland—a few hundred miles off the shores of England—in the summer of 1940. In July, 1941, the President decided to join Britain in the occupation of Iceland. Before this the President had established a naval patrol. That is, American destroyers and planes were sent out into the Atlantic into combat zones to hunt submarines and report the presence of these submarines to the British who would then send destroyers or planes to drop depth bombs on them. To say we were not at war with Germany when our Navy was acting as a scout for the British Navy is to close our eyes to the truth. But when we reinforced the British army in Iceland and proceeded to use Iceland as a base for this naval patrol in the very heart of the European combat waters we were in the war beyond all dispute. Mr. Churchill hailed the occupation of Iceland as a 'new cooperation between the British and American armed forces.' Cooperation in what? In the war against Germany. Charles Hurd, in the *New York Times*, wrote Nov. 9, 1941: 'The establishment of a naval base in Iceland marked a change by which American international policy stepped from one of passive aid to Great Britain and her allies into active participation in the Battle

of the Atlantic.' Against whom was the battle of the Atlantic being fought? Against Germany. If we were 'actively participating' in that battle we were participating in a war against Germany. The *New York Times*, defending these acts, said: "The Nazis made war on us in the Atlantic. We are making war on them in return".²⁷⁶

July 10, 1941.

In an introduction to the 1939 volume of his public papers and addresses, Franklin D. Roosevelt on July 10, 1941, wrote: "There can be no question that the people of the United States in 1939 were determined to remain neutral in fact and in deed . . . The American people have gradually come to the realization that this is not exclusively other peoples' war, but that it is approaching dangerously close to their own shores . . . It is with that realization and with full appreciation of the true nature of the Nazi design upon the world, that the feeling of strict neutrality and aloofness which influenced the American people in September of 1939 and during the beginning of 1940 had completely disappeared as of July 1941, as this is being written . . . With clear realization, however, of the grave danger to the United States, to the western hemisphere, and to civilization itself, our people have resolutely determined to arm themselves to the teeth, and, at the same time, to help to the limit those nations which are still resisting the aggressors and which still stand between us and a Nazi attack."²⁷⁷

July 17, 1941.

The 1940 volume of *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, carries the subtitle: War—And Aid to Democracies. In the Intro-

duction which he signed on July 17, 1941, the President wrote: "In June of 1940, as France was falling under the direct attack of the Nazi juggernaut, two things appeared to be perfectly clear. First, that America must at once and with the greatest possible speed arm itself with all the new machinery of war. Second, that the chief hope upon which America could rely for the necessary time required to carry on this rearmament program was the continuance of the British resistance to the Nazis . . . The only peace possible with Hitler is the peace that comes from complete surrender. How can one speak of a negotiated peace in this war when a peace treaty would be as binding upon the Nazis as a bond of gangsters and outlaws? The course that the American people have now taken for themselves in their 'all-out' aid to Great Britain and other nations resisting the aggression of dictators, is a course prompted fundamentally by hard-headed self-interest and self-concern."²⁷⁸

July 17, 1941.

The President issued a proclamation banning United States trading with 1800 firms and persons in Latin America believed to be agents of Germany and Italy.

July 19, 1941.

The Japanese military and diplomatic secret code was "cracked" by the United States Intelligence Service and thereafter throughout the war, their secret messages were intercepted and deciphered. Two volumes, totaling 379 pages of these deciphered messages prior to December 7th were turned over to the Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee.

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

July 21, 1941.

The President appealed to Congress for legislation permitting retention of selective service men, National Guardsmen, and reserve components in armed service beyond the twelve months' service hitherto authorized.

July 26, 1941.

The President issued an Executive Order freezing Japanese and Chinese assets in the United States. "The inclusion of China in the Executive Order, in accordance with the wishes of the Chinese government, is a continuation of this government's policy of assisting China."

Concerning this action, Walter Lippman wrote: "*This was a declaration of economic war.* Along with the other economic and military measures taken at the time by Australia, the Netherlands, and Great Britain, it was what the Japanese called it: 'an anti-Japanese encirclement policy'."²⁷⁹

The Navy Report on Pearl Harbor, Section XVI, says: "On July 26, 1941, Japanese assets in the United States were frozen . . . There was a feeling on the part of the U. S. officials that hostilities, unless prevented by some means, would become an eventuality in the not distant future. They were familiar with the Japanese trait of attacking without declaration of war, as had been done against China in 1894, and against Russia in 1904."

July 26, 1941.

President Roosevelt issued a military order placing the Philippine Army and Navy under U. S. military command, and recalled General MacArthur to active service and placed him in command of the United States army in the Philippines.

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

July 30, 1941.

An Executive Order established the Economic Defense Board.

August 2, 1941.

The Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles wrote to Ambassador Ourmansky: "I am pleased to inform you that the Government of the United States has decided to give all economic assistance practicable for the purpose of strengthening the Soviet Union in its struggle against armed aggression."

August 14, 1941.

Information was released concerning the famous meeting on the Atlantic Ocean of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, together with the text of the Atlantic Charter.

One of the important subjects discussed was the prospect of war with Japan. "Churchill wished to meet the issue head on," wrote Forrest Davis and Ernest K. Lindley in *How War Came: An American White Paper; From the Fall of France to Pearl Harbor*.²⁸⁰ "He asked the President . . . to join in an ultimative declaration to Japan . . . Mr. Roosevelt feared in August that war in the Pacific was a matter of weeks or months. Yet he knew the country's unreadiness, he was under solicitation from the armed forces for 'more time . . .' Back in August, therefore, the President had temporized. 'Wouldn't we be better off in three months?' he asked. Churchill agreed, still doubting, however, that the respite would be forthcoming without immediate concerted action. 'Leave that to me,' said the President. '*I think I can baby them along for three months . . .*'"

Winston Churchill subsequently, in the speech

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

in Parliament, January 28, 1942, said: "It has been the policy of the Cabinet at all costs to avoid embroilment with Japan until we were sure the United States would also be engaged . . . On the other hand the probability, since the Atlantic Conference at which I discussed these matters with President Roosevelt, that the United States, *even if not attacked*, would come into the war in the Far East and thus make the final victory assured, seemed to allay some of the anxieties and that expectation has not been falsified by events."

August 15, 1941.

President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill *sent a joint message* to President Stalin, in which they said: "We realize fully how vitally important to the defeat of Hitlerism is the brave and steadfast resistance of the Soviet Union and we feel therefore that we must not in any circumstances fail to act quickly and immediately in this matter of planning the program for the future allocation of our joint resources."

August 17, 1941.

Prince Konoye, Prime Minister of Japan, *suggested a personal conversation between himself and President Roosevelt* at some midway geographical point, in the hope of arriving at peaceful solutions of threatening problems.

August 18, 1941.

The President announced plans to speed planes to the British in the Middle East.

August 24, 1941.

Prime Minister Churchill in a world-wide radio address said: "The United States are laboring with infinite patience to arrive at a fair and amicable

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

settlement which will give Japan the utmost reassurance for her legitimate interests. We earnestly hope these negotiations will succeed. But this I must say: That if these hopes should fail, we shall, of course, range ourselves unhesitatingly at the side of the United States . . . You will, perhaps have noticed that the President of the United States and the British representative, in what is aptly called the Atlantic charter, have *jointly pledged their countries to the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny.*"

August 26, 1941.

The President announced the sending of a military mission to China.

August 27, 1941.

The Prime Minister of Japan again urged a personal meeting between himself and President Roosevelt, saying: "I consider it, therefore, of urgent necessity that the two heads of the Government should meet first to discuss from a broad standpoint all important problems between Japan and America covering the entire Pacific area, and to explore the possibility of saving the situation."

Summer, 1941.

The Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee received from President Roosevelt's secret files a memorandum written by General Marshall sometime during the summer of 1941, saying: "Britain is reaching limit of usable manpower. We must supplement her forces."

September 1, 1941.

In a radio address the President said: "We are engaged on a grim and perilous task. Forces of insane violence have been let loose by Hitler upon

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

this earth. We must do our full part in conquering them. For these forces may be unleashed on this nation as we go about our business of protecting the proper interests of our country. The task of defeating Hitler may be long and arduous . . . I know that I speak the conscience and determination of the American people when I say that *we shall do everything in our power to crush Hitler and his Nazi forces.*"

September 2, 1941.

An Executive Order extended powers for foreign ship seizure.

September 6, 1941.

The Japanese Prime Minister conferred for three hours and a half with Ambassador Grew, expressing the utmost concern that the proposed meeting with President Roosevelt be held without delay. "Prince Konoye repeatedly stressed the view that time is of the essence . . . Prince Konoye feels confident that all problems and questions at issue can be disposed of to our mutual satisfaction during the meeting with the President . . ."

September 11, 1941.

In a radio address the President discussed the sinking of the United States destroyer *Greer*, saying: "This was piracy—legally and morally . . . We have sought no shooting war with Hitler. We do not seek it now. But neither do we want peace so much, that we are willing to pay for it by permitting him to attack our naval and merchant ships while they are on legitimate business . . . But when you see a rattlesnake poised to strike, you do not wait until he has struck before you crush him. These Nazi submarines and raiders are the

rattlesnakes of the Atlantic . . . From now, if German or Italian vessels of war enter the waters, the protection of which is necessary for American defense, they do so at their own peril. The orders which I have given as Commander-in-Chief to the United States Army and Navy are to carry out this policy—at once . . . I have no illusions about the gravity of this step.”

Concerning the situation then prevailing, Denys Smith, a British correspondent in the United States, subsequently wrote: “During the autumn of 1941 the United States passed from a state of benevolent neutrality to a state of limited belligerency. The American Atlantic fleet was forced into the shooting war by German naval tactics . . . *The American Navy had entered the shooting war.*”²⁸¹

September 18, 1941.

The President recommended to Congress the appropriation of an additional \$5,985,000,000 for Lend-Lease operations, the original appropriation of \$7,000,000,000 nearing exhaustion.

September 27, 1941.

The Japanese Ambassador again urged the Secretary of State to respond favorably and speedily to the suggestion that the Japanese Prime Minister and President Roosevelt meet face to face, saying: “On our side, the ship to carry the Prime Minister is ready. The members of his suite including a full General and a full Admiral have been privately appointed. The party is ready to depart at any moment . . . Time, as I have often said, is a vital factor from both internal and international viewpoints.”

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

September 29, 1941.

Ambassador Grew strongly urged the Secretary of State to respond favorably to the suggestion that the Prime Minister and the President meet personally to consider outstanding questions, saying: "The Ambassador expresses his earnest hope therefore that so propitious a period be not permitted to slip by without a new foundation having been laid . . ."

October 2, 1941.

In a long statement to the Japanese Ambassador, Secretary Hull expressed doubt as to the advisability of a personal meeting of the President and the Prime Minister until a greater degree of agreement on important issues had previously been reached.

Fourteen days later the Konoye Cabinet fell and a golden opportunity was lost. On September 30, 1941, Ambassador Grew had written in his diary: "For a Prime Minister of Japan thus to shatter all precedent and tradition in this land of subservience to precedent and tradition, and *to wish to come hat in hand, so to speak, to meet the President of the United States on American soil*, is a gauge of the determination of the Government to undo the vast harm already accomplished in alienating our powerful and progressively angry country."²⁸²

It is possible that the war with Japan might have been averted if the President had met the Prime Minister in a generous spirit and worked out a settlement which would have stopped the aggression and expansion of Japan while at the same time helping Japan to solve her desperately serious problems and enabling the Japanese Govern-

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

ment "to save face." President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, however, *had lost all confidence in the Japanese Government and had already made up their minds that it was better to fight Japan sooner rather than later.*

October 5, 1941.

General MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo sent a document to the Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee showing that Japanese carrier plane pilots, at a secret meeting attended by Admiral Yamamoto, were briefed on October 5, 1941, for a December 7 attack on the United States Fleet, but the enemy fleet's striking force put to sea on November 26 under orders to return to base "should it appear certain" that Japanese-American negotiations would end amicably.

October 9, 1941.

In a message to Congress advocating revisions of the Neutrality Act, the President said: "The revisions which I suggest do not call for a declaration of war any more than the Lend-Lease Act called for a declaration of war . . . I recommend the repeal of section 6 of the Act of November 4, 1939, which prohibits the arming of American flag ships engaged in foreign commerce . . . Our merchant ships are sailing the seas on missions connected with the defense of the United States."

October 14, 1941.

Admiral Kimmel issued instructions, warning "That a declaration of war may be preceded by: (1) *a surprise attack on ships in Pearl Harbor.*"²⁸³

October 16, 1941.

The Konoye cabinet fell, and Ambassador Grew made this entry in his diary: "Everyone, includ-

ing myself, was surprised, for although I knew that the failure of progress in the American-Japanese conversations would almost certainly bring about Konoye's fall sooner or later, I had not looked for it so soon."²⁸⁴

October 27, 1941.

In a Navy Day address the President said: "The forward march of Hitler and Hitlerism can be stopped—and it will be stopped. Very simply and very bluntly—we are pledged to pull our own oar in the destruction of Hitlerism . . . I say that we do not propose to take this lying down. Our determination not to take it lying down has been expressed in the orders to the American Navy to shoot on sight. These orders stand . . . Our American merchant ships must be protected by our American Navy. It can never be doubted that the goods will be delivered by this nation, whose Navy believes in the tradition of 'Damn the torpedoes; full speed ahead!' . . . we Americans have cleared our decks and taken our battle stations."

November 3, 1941.

Ambassador Grew warned the Secretary of State that Japan might make "*an all-out, do-or-die attempt, actually risking national hara-kiri*, to make Japan impervious to economic embargoes abroad rather than to yield to foreign pressure . . . Japan may resort with dangerous and dramatic suddenness to measures which might make inevitable war with the United States."

November 4, 1941.

In his diary, Ambassador Grew wrote: ". . . war between Japan and the United States may come with dangerous and dramatic suddenness. That important telegram is on record for all time."

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

November 5, 1941.

Announcement was made at the White House that the President and the Prime Minister of Canada had set up a Joint Defense Production Committee to coordinate the capacities of the two countries for the production of defense materials.

November 5, 1941.

"On 5 November 1941, the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff, United States Army, submitted a joint memorandum to the President, *recommending that no ultimatum be delivered to Japan* at that time and giving, as one of the basic reasons, the existing numerical superiority of the Japanese Fleet over the United States Pacific Fleet."²⁸⁵

November 6, 1941.

Announcement was made of plans to make available to Soviet Russia Lend-Lease aid up to one billion dollars.

November 7, 1941.

Secretary Hull stated at a Cabinet meeting "that relations between Japan and the United States were extremely critical and that there was an 'imminent possibility' that Japan might at any time start a new military movement of conquest by force."²⁸⁶

November 23, 1941.

Mr. W. Averill Harriman, the President's personal agent in London, said: "*The United States Navy is shooting Germans—German submarines and aircraft at sea.*"

November 24, 1941.

The White House announced that, in agreement with The Netherlands, a contingent of the United

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

States Army had occupied Surinam in Dutch Guiana in order to protect valuable sources of bauxite.

November 25, 1941.

The Army on Pearl Harbor, Section C-2, says: "The War Council met on the 25th of November, 1941. Fortunately, we have the advantage of the contemporary diary of the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson . . . This diary reads: "Then at 12 o'clock I went to the White House where we were until nearly half past 1. At the meeting were Hull, Knox, Marshall, Stark and myself. There the President brought up the relations with the Japanese. He brought up the event that *we were likely to be attacked perhaps as soon as—perhaps next Monday*, for the Japs are notorious for making an attack without warning, and the question was what should we do."

November 25, 1941.

Rear Admiral Inglis testified before the Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee that on November 25, 1941, the Navy ordered merchant ships in the Pacific convoyed.

November 26, 1941.

The Army Report on Pearl Harbor, Section C-2, says: "What the Secretary of State appears to have done was to have his conference with the Japanese Ambassadors and to hand them the 'Ten Points.' . . . Whether or not the Secretary of State considers now that this is not an ultimatum, nevertheless the Japanese did so consider it, and acted upon it as such by notifying the task force, as the evidence shows was waiting at Takan Bay, to start the movement against Hawaii. . . ."

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

November 26, 1941.

The text of a message from President Roosevelt to Francis B. Sayre, High Commissioner of the Philippines, dated November 26, 1941, was made public by the Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee, in which the President said: "I consider it possible that this next Japanese aggression might cause an outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Japan."

November 26, 1941.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, told two members of the Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee that by November 26, 1941, he was convinced that war with Japan was imminent that all F.B.I. agents in the Hawaiian area were put on "absolute" alert, all leaves were canceled and no man could be away from his station or a telephone for longer than thirty minutes.

November 27, 1941.

Concerning the message sent to General MacArthur, the Army Report on Pearl Harbor says: "The sentence, 'If hostilities cannot, repeat cannot, be avoided *the United States desires that Japan commit the first overt act*,' was thus phrased because as Gerow said he testified before the Roberts Commission: 'We pointed out in the message the possible danger of attack and directed reconnaissance and other necessary measures without fully carrying into effect the provisions of the plan, which would have required hostile action against Japan, and *the President had definitely stated that he wanted Japan to commit the first overt act*.'"

November 28, 1941.

The Navy Report on Pearl Harbor, Section

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

XVII, says: "On November 28, 1941, the Chief of Naval Operations repeated to Admiral Kimmel the information contained in a dispatch which the War Department, on November 27, had transmitted to Lieutenant General Short, and other Army addresses, to the effect that negotiations appeared to be terminated, that Japanese future action was unpredictable, that hostile action was possible at any moment, and that *it was desirable that Japan commit the first overt act in case hostilities could not be avoided.*"

December 6, 1941.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his comments upon the Navy Report on Pearl Harbor, Section 12 (a), says: "Although it was not known on 6 December precisely when or where the attack was to be delivered, there was ample evidence to base the conclusion that a surprise move was due within narrow limits of time."

Summary.

Let us now bring together the most important elements in the record and watch the Administration being pushed by international events and leading the American people step by step into the economic war, the shooting war, and on to Pearl Harbor.

The "quarantine-the-aggressor" speech.

The promise to come to the aid of Canada.

The use of an "excuse" as a basis for refusing to apply the Neutrality Act in the Far East.

The warning that methods will be used short of war but stronger than words.

The removal of the embargo against the sale of arms from the Neutrality Act.

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

The notification of Japan that the commercial treaty would not be renewed, because of the determination to adopt "retaliatory" measures.

The drafting into active military service of the National Guard and reserves.

Ever-increasingly severe denunciation of the dictators.

The transfer of vast stores of military weapons and supplies from the United States Army to Great Britain.

The exchange of 50 United States destroyers for British bases.

The passing of the Selective Service Act.

The agreement of the President with the Ambassador to Japan that the "principal question at issue is whether it is to our advantage to have that showdown sooner or to have it later."

The adoption of Lend-Lease and total war commitments approximating 40 billion dollars by June, 1941.

The Secretary of the Navy's warning in January, 1941, that a surprise attack might be made on Pearl Harbor.

Ambassador Grew's warning in January, 1941, that a surprise attack might be made on Pearl Harbor.

The avowal of "unqualified, all-out aid for Britain, Greece and China."

The military staff discussions among American, British Commonwealth and Dutch officers.

The military occupation of Greenland.

The extension of naval patrols in north and south Atlantic waters.

Lend-Lease aid to China and the transfer of vet-

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC

eran airmen from the United States Army to the Chinese Army.

The 40 billion dollar commitment for defense measures and aid to Britain.

The military occupation of Iceland.

The blacklisting of 1800 firms in Latin America.

The freezing of Japan's assets in the United States.

The placing of the Philippine Army and Navy under United States military command.

The Atlantic Charter and the President's effort to "baby them along for three months."

The President's refusal to meet personally with the Prime Minister of Japan.

The President's statement that "we shall do everything in our power to crush Hitler and his Nazi forces."

The order to American warships in certain Atlantic waters to shoot at sight.

The arming of merchant ships.

Admiral Kimmel's warning of a "surprise attack on ships in Pearl Harbor."

Ambassador Grew's warning that Japan might make "an all-out, do-or-die attempt, actually risking national hara-kari."

The President's warning that "we were likely to be attacked perhaps as soon as—perhaps next Monday."

Secretary Hull's ultimatum to Japan.

The directive to General MacArthur that if hostilities cannot be avoided, "the United States desires that Japan commit the first overt act."

The President's statement "that he wanted Japan to commit the first overt act."

The Chief of Naval Operations' report to Admiral

PRE-PEARL-HARBOR POLICY

Kimmel that "it was desirable that Japan commit the first overt act in case hostilities could not be avoided."

Let it be remembered that on August 14, 1936, three years after Hitler became dictator, President Roosevelt said: "We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war, and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say 'no' to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war."

In those days the President was more determined to keep out of war than he was to stop Hitler, but a year later wisely or unwisely he became more determined to stop Hitler than to stay out of war. His will to say "no" to those who would let us go to war became weaker and weaker. His will to stop the dictators became stronger and stronger. Step by step, day by day, wisely or unwisely, he led the American people into the economic war, then into the shooting war, and on to Pearl Harbor.

CHAPTER VII

THE POWER OF GOD IN AN
ATOMIC AGE

A third world war can be averted, but only by a titanic effort on the part of a mighty movement of people in response to the yearning and pleading love of the living God. To the degree that we find and do the will of God we will make changes in old policies; basic, drastic, far-reaching changes in nationalism, imperialism and militarism. We will no longer seek security and justice by maintaining preponderance of armed might and superior ability to wage atomic warfare, but will place our trust in mutual aid in the solution of common problems under the reign of international law functioning through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual confidence.

The good news of the gospel, the discovery and proclamation of this new way by Jesus, is the power of God unto salvation for individuals and for society. This is the Christian conviction. Nowhere else will we find redemption. There is no other name, there is no other way.²⁸⁷ Live today as good members of God's home, run the risks, take the consequences, and leave the outcome in the hands of the Father. Render total allegiance to Jesus as the fullest revelation of God. Love God and man as Jesus loved them. Dwell in unbroken companionship with the Father, in adoration, obedience and devotion. Serve God's people with selfless concern and consecration. Strive for that dominant desire to do God's will which opens life to the power of God. Maintain intimate comradeship

with Jesus and follow wherever he leads whatever it costs. Take up the cross daily and follow on. Trust God and have faith in his way as made known in Jesus. Therefore, pray without ceasing. Practice the presence of God until God becomes more real than any human friend. Practice alternation, praying while busily doing God's work, praying while waiting expectantly in silent repose. Walk in the light, step by step, and expect more illumination as needed. Seek comradeship with others who are endeavoring to walk in the light. Live today as good members of God's home. Thus God will be able to win us and draw us into lives of self-giving love and holy fellowship.

God is doing everything he can to win us. He has placed us as free moral agents in a moral universe and bound us with the cords of mutual interdependence. God is holy love. God is loving holiness. Ever he sustains the dependability of the processes of the universe, and ever does he maintain the inviolability of human freedom. Never does he manipulate the universe into chaos, and never does he manipulate his children as puppets. Because we are free moral agents in a moral universe, God is constantly endeavoring to win us to the wise and right use of our faculties. When with ardent desire we seek his help, he is able to enter the open door and quicken our minds, stir our emotions, make sensitive and accurate our conscience, and strengthen our wills. Deep within us are latent possibilities of response to the magnetic appeal of our Father. Created in the spiritual image of God, we can respond to his affectionate yearning for comradeship and collaboration.

When God thus wins us, to that degree the Kingdom of God comes within us and through us.

The way of life has been made known to us through God's revelation in Jesus. God himself is doing everything that he can do to win us to lives of love and fellowship. The coming of the good society awaits faithful response from us. We must follow, we must take up cross and follow. Fidelity is required of us. We must discover as fully as we can the will of God for our lives, not by ourselves alone but through response to God's pleading voice within. We must do the will of God as completely as we can, opening wide the doors of our lives through ardent desire to walk with him in adoring companionship and zealous collaboration.

Fidelity is a condition of power. The good news of the gospel is the power of God when it flows through the lives of loyal disciples. When we ignore God and when we defy his holy will for our lives, we cannot be open channels through which this power may flow. When we turn aside from God's way and walk in the opposite direction, we frustrate and obstruct the achievement of his holy purpose.

The way of atomic war is utterly contrary to the way of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. If Christians give their consent and support to preparedness to wage war with atomic bombs and other weapons of annihilation and devastation, they will thereby repudiate the way of Jesus. Even before the obliteration bombing of German cities and before the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the common judgment of Protestant Christians had been expressed at Oxford: *"War involves compulsory*

enmity, diabolical outrage against human personality, and a wanton distortion of the truth. War is a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and him crucified. No justification of war must be allowed to conceal or minimize this fact." Members of the Federal Council's Commission on the Relation of the Church to the War in the Light of the Christian Faith in 1944 unanimously reaffirmed this pronouncement.²⁸⁸

To say that we Christians can deliberately with calculated efficiency use atomic bombs and other weapons to kill thousands or even millions of human beings, and at the same time say that we are earnestly striving to take Jesus seriously and to do the will of God as it is made known in Christ, is to destroy all meaning of words. The way of Jesus is a way, and it is an utterly different way from the way of atomic war. In modern war, explosive and fire are used indiscriminately against men, women, and children; against combatants and non-combatants; against guilty and innocent. It is not the will of God that we Americans prepare to kill millions of Englishmen or Japanese or Germans or Russians. This we can say with assurance and finality.

The way of atomic war is monstrous not only because of what it does to human beings as it mutilates and kills. Preparedness to use atomic bombs against men and women and children is a proclamation of faith, a confession of confidence in the rightness and effectiveness of human slaughter as a means of seeking safety and of maintaining justice. It is impossible to profess this faith, this

confidence, and at the same time manifest genuine faith in the power of self-giving, forgiving love of enemies. To the degree that we place our faith in the destructiveness of the atomic bomb, to that extent we lack faith in the redemptive power of the way of the cross, the way of all-embracing, ever-continuing sacrificial love.

The contrast between the way of atomic war and the way of the cross is stark and irreconcilable. Christians may differ in judgment about the rightness and wrongness of using varying degrees of physical force; they may hold different convictions about the justification for using various types of police action; they may even differ in conviction about the killing of a guilty man in order to save the life of an innocent woman—but *it will be absolutely fatal if the churches remain substantially divided in judgment about the utter contrast between these two ways of life*. Even if active and articulate Christians should unite in disavowing any confidence in the atomic bomb as a means of defense, and therefore should unite in refusing to approve of preparedness to use these weapons, there is serious question whether the churches will have sufficient power to stop the mad plunge toward a third world war. For Christians to remain substantially divided on this life-and-death issue is to insure moral paralysis for the church as an institution.

Loyalty to Jesus and determination to do the will of God require us to say that we will not trust the use of atomic war as a means of defense, and that we will not consent to preparedness to use it, and that we will not voluntarily and directly engage in such a war under any circumstances. Such

THE POWER OF GOD IN AN ATOMIC AGE

action will not in itself prevent another war, but it must be part of any determined effort in this generation to take Jesus seriously.

Faith in peaceful means of settling controversies among nations is urgently required. Feebleness of confidence in the power of international goodwill operating through appropriate agencies of international justice and friendship is at present paralyzing efforts to take the steps which must be taken if war is to be averted. Action is determined by faith. We do that in which we have confidence. If we trust atomic war, we will prepare for it. If we trust pacific means, we will prepare to use them.

Our minds must be cleared of the illusion that it is possible to trust both atomic war and pacific means. So long as peoples believe that preparedness to slaughter human beings indiscriminately by the million is justifiable and effective, they will continue to prepare for a war of annihilation and will lack the confidence to make serious and sustained efforts to create and use the necessary international agencies.

The fatal weakness of the United Nations Organization is its trust in armed power. Most of its major responsibilities are concentrated in the Security Council which is authorized and empowered to use economic and armed might to compel observance of international agreements. Because the peoples of the member nations trust in armed power and are afraid that superior armed force may be used against them, the Security Council can act only when there is agreement among Great Britain, Russia, China, France and the United States, plus two other members. This

means, in fact, that there is scarcely one chance in a hundred that armed action will ever be taken by the Security Council. So long as there is this agreement, other means of dealing with weaker nations are available. There will be no need to drop atomic bombs on Bolivia or Liberia or Korea. It is a practical certainty that the Security Council will never use arms against one of the Big Five, and it is extremely unlikely that such action will ever be taken against a friend or "protectorate" or ally of one of the Big Five.

All of this is not to say that national armed action will not be taken against Great Britain or Russia or China or France or the United States. We are simply asserting that armed action will not be taken by the United Nations Organization because of the veto power retained by the permanent members of the Security Council. The impotence of the United Nations Organization, as constituted at present, to deal effectively with serious crises rising among the Big Five, is strengthening faith in national armed forces. The tendency is for every nation to trust its own armed power and that of its allies.

There is urgent need for the realization that the impotence of the United Nations Organization is caused by the faith of peoples everywhere in armed power. So long as this confidence is maintained they will neither empower any international organization to use armed action without the consent of every "great" power, nor will they cease to prepare to use their own national armies and navies. That is to say, faith in armed might, paralyzes international action.

The work of the churches therefore becomes

utterly important. It is their unique function to challenge individuals to take Jesus seriously and live every day as good members of God's home, running the risks and taking the consequences and trusting God for the outcome. It is the especial responsibility of the churches to make plain the inseparable relationship between ends and means. Jesus' way offers more than desirable destination; it shows the steps to be taken in order to reach the desired goal. The churches must now proclaim the truth that the method of atomic war cannot achieve security and friendship among the nations. On the contrary, faith in atomic war is one of the most formidable barriers to world peace and justice.

It is of the utmost importance therefore that individual Christians and churches as institutions make unequivocally clear their attitude toward preparedness to use atomic war with its indiscriminate slaughter as a means of seeking defense and justice. The least that a Christian may properly do in the face of the monstrous threat of a third world war is *to say without qualification that he will place no trust in atomic bombs and other weapons of modern war, that he will never consent to preparedness to use these weapons of annihilation and devastation, that he will never participate voluntarily and directly in any atomic war, and that he will never consent to the waging of such a war.*

This withdrawal of faith from atomic weapons of war will make possible the increase of confidence in pacific means of seeking security and justice. Churches as institutions should proclaim their refusal to trust weapons of annihilation and devastation and should profess their faith in inter-

national goodwill operating through appropriate international agencies. Local and district and state and national religious bodies can help substantially to generate the faith needed by taking corporate action along these lines. The urgency of the situation demands that the churches disentangle themselves from the war system with all possible thoroughness and speed.

The churches should place the utmost emphasis upon the necessity of choosing risks, and choosing consequences. Under prevailing conditions, there is no safe course of action open to the peoples of the earth. We will be confronted with serious danger whichever policy we follow. Most perilous and most disastrous of all is the policy of trusting atomic weapons and preparing to wage atomic war. Less threatening but still dangerous is the policy of trusting goodwill and pacific means of settling international controversies through international agencies of justice and friendship.

The urgency of the crisis demands that the churches challenge their members to follow their Lord with confidence and daring. Because the way of atomic war is so flagrantly in contrast to the way of Jesus, Christians should repudiate the way of war and resolutely follow the way of Jesus; follow with courage equal to that of soldiers on the battlefield; follow with courage equal to that of parents and wives of men on military duty. *Christians should manifest more faith in the way of the cross than multitudes of citizens have in the way of explosive and fire.*

Faith will decide whether or not we fight a third world war. If we trust military weapons we will perpetuate the present arrangement which breeds

wars. If we trust organized and aggressive goodwill we will transform the present war-producing system into a peace system which removes the causes of war and maintains the agencies of pacific settlement of international disputes.

Faith is accompanied by courage. We usually find courage to do that in which we strongly believe. There is nothing in human nature which makes it natural for a man to be brave in battle and cowardly in following religious convictions. Fear often produces daring, fear combined with hatred. Confidence and affection also bring forth courageous devotion. In hatred a man will risk his life trying to kill another man. In love a man will risk his life trying to save another man who is threatening to kill him. No soldier in battle ever displayed more bravery than Jesus manifested heroic devotion on the way to the cross.

Love God and do right; do right and trust God—this is the way of Jesus. Listen: "It was then that Jesus Christ for the first time explained to his disciples that he had to go to Jerusalem and endure great suffering there at the hands of the elders, high priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised to life on the third day. And Peter took him aside and began to reprove him for it, saying, 'God bless you, Master! that can never happen to you!' But he turned and said to Peter, 'Get out of my sight, you Satan! You hinder me, for you do not side with God, but with men!'"²³⁹

"On leaving there they passed through Galilee. He did not want anyone to know of their journey, for he was teaching his disciples, telling them that the Son of man would be betrayed into the hands of men, that they would kill him, and that when

he was killed he would rise after three days. But they did not understand what he said, and they were afraid to ask what he meant."²⁹⁰

"But I must go on today and tomorrow and the next day, for it is not right for a prophet to die outside Jerusalem. O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! murdering the prophets, and stoning those who are sent to her, how often I have longed to gather your children around me, as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, but you refused."²⁹¹

"As they went on their way to Jerusalem, Jesus walked ahead of them, and they were in dismay, and those who still followed were afraid. And he took the Twelve aside again and began to tell them what was going to happen to him. 'See!' he said, 'we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man will be handed over to the high priests and scribes, and they will condemn him to death and hand him over to the heathen and they will ridicule him and spit on him and flog him and kill him; and three days after he will rise again'."²⁹²

"Then they came to a place called Gethsemane, and he told his disciples, 'Sit here till I pray.' But he took Peter and James and John along with him; and as he began to feel appalled and agitated, he said to them, 'My heart is sad, sad, even to death; stay here and watch.' Then he went forward a little and fell to the earth, praying that the hour might pass away from him, if possible. 'Abba, Father,' he said, 'Thou canst do anything. Take this cup away from me. Yet, not what I will but what thou wilt'."²⁹³

"But they persisted with loud outcries in demanding that he be crucified, and their shouting won . . . Two criminals were also led out to execu-

tion with him. When they reached the place called the Skull, they crucified him there, with the criminals one at his right and one at his left . . . ”²⁹⁴

“At noon darkness spread over the whole country, and lasted until three in the afternoon. And at three o’clock Jesus called out loudly, ‘Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?’ which means, ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’ ”²⁹⁵ “And the curtain before the sanctuary was torn in two. Then Jesus gave a loud cry, and said, ‘Father, I intrust my spirit to your hands!’ With these words he expired.”²⁹⁶

Again and again throughout his ministry, Jesus warned his disciples of the extreme peril of following his way and repeatedly challenged them to follow with boldness and devotion. Listen again: “Here I am sending you out like sheep among wolves. So you must be wise like serpents, and guileless like doves. But be on your guard against men, for they will give you up to their courts, and have you flogged in their synagogues, and you will be brought before governors and kings on my account . . . One brother will give up another to death, and a father his child, and children will turn against their parents, and have them put to death. You will be hated by everybody on my account, but the man who holds out to the very end will be saved.”²⁹⁷

“And he called the people and his disciples to him and said to them, ‘If anyone wants to go with me, he must disregard himself, and take his cross and follow me. For whoever wants to preserve his own life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for me and for the good news will preserve it’ ”²⁹⁸

"After this, the Master appointed seventy-two other disciples, and sent them on as his Messengers, two and two, in advance, to every town and place that he himself was intending to visit. 'The harvest,' he said, 'is abundant, but the labourers are few. Therefore pray to the Owner of the harvest to send labourers to gather his harvest. Now, go. Remember, I am sending you out as my Messengers like lambs among wolves'." ²⁹⁹

"Truly, truly I tell you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains a single grain; but if it dies, it bears rich fruit. He who loves his life loses it, and he who cares not for his life in this world will preserve it for eternal life." ³⁰⁰

"What I command you to do is to love one another. If the world hates you, remember that it hated me first. If you belonged to the world, the world would love what was its own. But it is because you do not belong to the world, but I have selected you from the world, that the world hates you. Remember what I said to you: No slave is greater than his master. If they have persecuted me they will persecute you too . . . They will exclude you from their synagogues; why, the time is coming when anyone who kills you will think he is doing religious service to God." ³⁰¹

In a generation when dying for causes has been the familiar practice of millions of youth, the churches must call for stronger faith and more heroic devotion in following the way of Jesus.

Young Communists have demonstrated their willingness to live sacrificially and to die bravely for Communism. Young patriots in many lands have shown unlimited courage in fighting for country.

Christians young and old must take Jesus seriously and follow him heroically wherever he leads whatever the cost.

This means that we must break with the war system as completely as possible. I do not mean by this any cheap-and-easy pledge-signing. Through all these years I have never believed in pledge-signing against participation in war and have never suggested that anyone sign such a pledge. I do believe, however, that every Christian is called upon to make a solemn choice between the way of Jesus and the way of war, and have repeatedly challenged men and women to choose the way of Jesus and proclaim to the world the resoluteness of their decision not to approve of war, and not to participate in it voluntarily and directly as a combatant.

As far back as 1923 I concluded my book, *War: Its Causes, Consequences and Cure*, with this challenge:

"The present situation demands extreme measures. Let the churches of America say to their own government and to the peoples of the earth: We feel so certain that war is now unchristian, futile and suicidal that we renounce completely the whole war system. We will never again sanction or participate in any war. We will not allow our pulpits and classrooms to be used as recruiting stations. We will not again give our financial or moral support to any war. We will seek security and justice in other ways. We believe in the latent goodness of all peoples everywhere, in love and spiritual processes as mightier than military weapons, and that the most certain means of overcoming evil is found in the spirit of the cross. We

pledge our time, our energy, our money, and, if necessary, our very lives, in the crusade to abolish war and to erect effective international processes of justice and goodwill. Does not the truest patriotism, as well as the deepest loyalty to Jesus' way of life, demand that individuals and churches should immediately and utterly repudiate the whole war system?"

It is not possible in wartime to avoid involuntary and indirect participation through the payment of various kinds of taxes and in numerous other ways. But the individual does have the power to decide whether he will consent to preparedness for war, whether he will consent to the waging of war by his government, whether he will participate in the war as an armed combatant, and whether he will participate directly in the manufacture of weapons of battle. Moral character is made possible by the sharp difference between involuntary and indirect participation in evil-doing and voluntary and direct participation. The conscientious objector who raises wheat which is made into flour and consumed by soldiers is participating in war in a sharply different way and to a substantially different degree than is the volunteer who kills his foe on the battlefield or who drops an atomic bomb upon a great city.

The imminence of the threat hovering over civilization requires Christians to disentangle themselves from the war system as completely and as rapidly as they can. *In peacetime the range of choice of decisions is wider than in wartime.* Every Christian has power to support or to oppose preparedness to wage atomic war. He can support or oppose military training of the youth of the

land. He can support or oppose the effort to obtain international abolition of military conscription. He can support or oppose the maintaining of military and naval bases in various parts of the earth. He can support or oppose colonial domination of subject peoples. He can support or oppose the effort to "stop Russia" by threats or by resorts to armed action. He can support or oppose the delegating of wider jurisdiction and greater authority to the United Nations Organization through limitations upon national sovereignty. He can support or oppose the policy of settling every conceivable controversy with another nation by pacific means only. He can support or oppose the effort to create the international mind and heart in place of extreme nationalism and narrow patriotism. He can support or oppose the making of huge appropriations for relief and rehabilitation of the victims of war. He can choose between the way of war and the way of Jesus. And the choices of millions of individuals will decide whether or not a third world war is to be fought.

The urgency of the crisis demands that churches proclaim their convictions in clear and ringing tones. From thousands of church congregations, conferences, conventions and assemblies should come forthright declarations of determination to take Jesus seriously by trusting goodwill and pacific means, and by repudiating and opposing military training and preparedness to wage atomic war and all resort to armed conflict. Similar pronouncements should come in a torrent from church women and church youth.

The ominous threat of an atomic war requires appropriate action from local congregations. After

thorough preparation, the local congregation should officially go on record concerning the Christian attitude toward an atomic war and toward preparedness to slaughter thousands or even millions of God's children in other lands. Preparation for this official action by the congregation should include: sermons by the minister, a series of discussions in classes, youth meetings, women's organizations, mid-week meetings, and the circulation of appropriate literature. The membership of the congregation might well be assembled in numerous discussion groups in various homes throughout the community. Throughout all this discussion, one question should be dominant; *what is the will of God for this church concerning preparedness to wage atomic war?*

If the nations are to avoid stumbling and staggering into another annihilating armed conflict, long steps away from the yawning chasm must quickly be taken. Nations must do certain things, and nations must stop doing certain things. World government must progressively be established, common problems must be solved by common action, economic and racial justice and fellowship must be achieved, goodwill and cooperative relations with Russia must be maintained, Germany and Japan must be restored to an honorable and equal place among the nations, empires must be transformed into commonwealths, the race of armaments must be stopped and the system of balance-of-armed-power must be brought to an end, the churches must take Jesus seriously by trusting goodwill and pacific means and by disentangling themselves from the war system, a mighty movement of peoples must be created so that govern-

THE POWER OF GOD IN AN ATOMIC AGE

ments will maintain friendly and cooperative relations and will refrain from hostile and provocative actions.

We must love God and do right; we must do right and trust God. We must live as good members of our Father's home, run the risks, take the consequences, and leave the outcome in the hands of God. Now is the time to prevent a third world war.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Edwin Campbell, *Zeppelins: The Past and Future*, and A. Rawlinson, *The Defense of London*.
2. See summary in *Time*, November 5, 1945.
3. See summary in *New York Times*, August 18, 1945.
4. *New York Times*, August 24, 1945.
5. *New York Times Magazine*, December 30, 1945, p. 5.
6. A poll taken by *Fortune* produced the following expression of opinion: 53.5 per cent replied: "We should have used the two bombs on cities, just as we did;" while an additional 22.7 per cent replied: "We should have quickly used many more of them before Japan had a chance to surrender." Thus 76.2 per cent favored the use of atomic bombs against entire populations of Japanese cities. *Fortune*, December, 1945, p. 305.
7. See an article by Nigel Tangye, *Foreign Affairs*, October, 1945, pp. 38-49.
8. See *The Christian Century*, December 5, 1945, p. 1341.
9. November 12, 1945.
12. *Collected Works of V. I. Lenin*, vol. III, p. 72; vol. XX, Book 1, pp. 156, 58; vol. XXI, Book 2, pp. 166, 176, 177; *Leninism*, by Joseph Stalin, pp. 23, 39; *Lenin on Britain*, p. 241. All published by International Publishers, New York.
13. Report Delivered at the Second All-Russian Congress of Political Education Departments, October 17, 1921.
14. Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, pp. 15, 20.
15. Op. cit., Vol. XX, Book 1, p. 85.
16. *Leninism*, pp. 125, 126.
17. William Henry Chamberlin, *The Russian Enigma*, p. 193. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
18. William Z. Foster, *Toward Soviet America*, pp. 130, 213, 40, 324. Published by Coward-McAnn, Inc., New York City.
20. Walter Duranty, *U.S.S.R.*, p. 39. Published by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.
21. *London Times*, Jan. 22, 1940.
22. David J. Dallin, *Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939-1942*, pp. 166, 167. Published by Yale University Press.
24. *Collected Works of V. I. Lenin*, vol. 20, Book 1, pp. 27, 31.
25. *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, Book 1, pp. 85, 86.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 200.
27. *The New Clarion*, July 22, 1933, p. 112.
28. Leon Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution*, vol. 3, p. 175. Published by Simon and Schuster, New York.
29. Trotsky, Vol. 3, p. 225.
30. *Ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 300.
31. David J. Dallin, *Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939-1942*, p. 10. Published by Yale University Press.
32. Lenin, Vol. XVII, pp. 323, 324.

FOOTNOTES

33. Quoted by William Henry Chamberlin, *The Russian Revolution*, Vol. 1, p. 77. Published by The Macmillan Company, New York.

34. Lenin, Vol. XV, p. 411.

35. Lenin, *Infantile Sickness of 'Leftism' in Communism*.

36. Lenin, Vol. XXIII, p. 182.

37. William Henry Chamberlin, *Russia's Iron Age*, p. 152. Published by Little, Brown and Company, Boston.

38. Quoted by Leon Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution*, Vol. 3, p. 396. Published by Simon and Schuster, New York.

39. David J. Dallin, *The Real Soviet Russia*, pp. 196, 197. Published by Yale University Press.

40. *Ibid*, p. 96.

41. William Henry Chamberlin, *The World's Iron Age*, p. 103. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York.

42. Walter Duranty, *U. S. S. R.*, pp. 227, 228. Published by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

43. David J. Dallin, *The Real Soviet Russia*, p. 88. Published by Yale University Press.

44. Edmund Stevens, *Russia Is No Riddle*, p. 296. Published by Greenberg, New York.

45. Edgar Snow, *The Pattern of Soviet Power*, p. 23. Published by Random House, New York.

46. Edgar Snow, *The Pattern of Soviet Power*, pp. 188, 189. Published by Random House, New York.

47. August, 1945.

48. The Charter was signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, by representatives of these 51 nations: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia. It is important to notice that the following 13 states were not included: Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, not counting the former nations annexed by the Soviet Union—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.

51. Published by Harper & Brothers, New York.

52. Clarence K. Streit, *Union Now With Britain*, p. 5. Published by Harper Brothers, New York.

53. *Ibid*, p. 215.

54. *Union Now*, p. 2.

57. James N. Rosenberg, "Power to Decide, None to Enforce," *The Nation*, Vol. 121, December 9, 1925, p. 650.

FOOTNOTES

62. *New York Times*, Nov. 23, 1945.
63. *New York Times*, Dec. 3, 1945.
67. These reports are available in the larger libraries throughout the nation.
71. *The New Republic*, October 18, 1943, pp. 536, 537.
73. Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, Vol. 1, p. 650. Published by the University of Chicago Press.
74. W. E. B. DuBois, *Color and Democracy; Colonies and Peace*, pp. 26-28. Published by Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York.
75. *New York Times*, September 6, 1945.
79. Matthew 5:1-16, 6:9-13, 6:33, 7:13-14, 7:21; Mark 12:28-31.
80. Matthew 6:26-34, 7:11; Luke 13:34, 35; John 3:16.
81. Romans 6:8; 26-39.
82. Matthew 5:44-48, 18:12-14; Luke 15:3-24; Romans 5:8, 8:39; John 3:1, 4:16; Psalms 23:1-6; Isaiah 53:2-12.
83. Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, pp. 378, 379, 380. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York City.
84. James 1:17; Matthew 6:9, 5:48; Galatians 6:7-9.
85. Romans 8:26.
86. Isaiah 1:11-17; Micah 6:8.
87. Matthew 25:31-46.
88. Matt. 5:43-48.
89. Raymond Bernard Blakney, *Meister Eckhart*, p. 132. Published by Harper & Brothers, New York.
90. Luke 12:6-7, 22-31, 15:4-7.
91. 1 Corinthians 3:16.
92. Thomas Kelly, *A Testament of Devotion*, p. 29. Published by Harper & Brothers, New York.
93. Matthew 7:12.
94. Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24; Matthew 16:25; Luke 17:33; Matthew 10:39; John 12:25.
95. Gen. 4:24; Matt. 18:22.
96. Mark 14:33.
97. Mark 11:15-18; Matthew 21:12-13; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-17.
98. G. H. C. MacGregor, *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism*, pp. 18, 19. Published by James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London; also by The Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York.
99. Matthew 10:34; Luke 12:51.
100. Luke 22:36-38.
101. Acts 5:29.
102. Matthew 23:13-39.
103. Jesus or Christianity.
104. Isaiah 53:2-6, 11, 12, *The Complete Bible: An American Translation*, by Smith-Goodspeed. Published by The University of Chicago Press. Referred to throughout as Smith-Goodspeed. Used by Permission.
105. The signatories to this affirmation that war is "a defiance

FOOTNOTES

of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and him crucified" were: Robert Lowry Calhoun, Edwin E. Aubrey, Roland H. Bainton, John C. Bennett, Conrad J. I. Bergendorff, B. Harvie Branscomb, Frank H. Caldwell, Angus Dun, Nels F. S. Ferre, Robert E. Fitch, Theodore M. Greene, Georgia E. Harkness, Walter M. Horton, John Knox, Umphrey Lee, John A. Mackay, Benjamin E. Mays, John T. McNeill, H. Richard Niebuhr, Reinhold Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck, Douglas V. Steere, Ernest Fremont Tittle, Henry P. Van Dusen, Theodore O. Wedel, Alexander C. Zabriskie.

106. Matthew 5:21, 27, 33, 38, 43.

107. Hebrew 1:1-3 *The New Testament: A Translation in the Language of the People*, by Charles B. Williams. Published by Bruce Humpries, Inc., Boston.

108. Deuteronomy 20:10-18 *The Bible: A New Translation*, by James Moffatt. Published by Harper and Brothers, New York.

109. I Samuel 15:18, 19, 32, 33.

110. Psalms 137:8, 9.

111. Psalms 58:10, 11.

112. Exodus 15:3.

113. Harry Emerson Fosdick, *A Guide To An Understanding of the Bible*, pp. 4, 5, 6. Published by Harper and Brothers, New York City.

114. Marion J. Benedict, *The God of the Old Testament in Relation to War*, pp. 11, 152. Published by Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

115. *The Church's Attitude to Peace and War*, by a committee of the Church of Scotland, pp. 3, 9, 10. Published by the Student Christian Movement Press, London.

116. See his invaluable pamphlet, *The Churches and War: Historic Attitudes Toward Christian Participation*, 72 pages. Published by The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 297 Fourth Ave., New York 10.

117. Published in 1919 by Headley Brothers, Ltd., London.

118. *Ibid.*, pp. 245, 246.

119. Professor Harnack's summary, Quoted by Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

120. See C. B. Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity*; Maude Aline Huttman, *The Establishment of Christianity and the Proscription of Paganism*; John B. Firth, *Constantine the Great*; A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, Chapter 6.

121. C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*, p. 589.

122. J. F. Michaud, *The History of the Crusades*, Vol. 1, p. 51.

123. James Ludlow, *The Age of the Crusades*, p. 167.

124. *Ibid.*, p. 132.

125. James Ludlow, *The Age of the Crusades*, pp. 94, 105, 106.

126. *Journal of Mental Science*, Vol. 53, p. 337.

127. Michaud, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 144.

128. G. G. Coulton, *The Death Penalty for Heresy from 1184 to 1921 A.D.*, p. 7.

129. See the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 1, pp. 277-287.

FOOTNOTES

130. See Frederic Palmer, *Heretics, Saints, and Martyrs*, p. 38.
131. *Ibid*, p. 8.
132. R. T. Smith, *The Church in France*, p. 288.
133. Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation*, p. 226.
134. See J. L. Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*.
135. Motley, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 337.
136. Motley, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, pp. 30, 31.
137. See H. G. Gilbert, *The Bible and Universal Peace*, pp. 154-194.
138. Quoted by J. M. Buckley, *A History of the Methodists in the United States*, p. 512.
139. July, 1861, pp. 403, 404.
140. C. B. Swaney, *Episcopal Methodism and Slavery*, p. 311, 313, 316.
141. C. B. Swaney, *op. cit.*, p. 318.
142. Merle Curti, *Peace or War: The American Struggle 1636-1936*, p. 258.
143. Newell Dwight Hillis, *The Blot on the Kaiser's 'Scutcheon*.
144. Quoted in the American Mercury, February, 1927.
145. Quoted by Devere Allen, *The Fight For Peace*, p. 41.
146. Edward Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Vol. 1, pp. 362, 365.
147. W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, Vol 2, pp. 269, 270.
149. Sidney B. Fay, *The Origins of the World War*, Vol. 2, pp. 547-549. Published by The Macmillan Company, New York.
150. *Ibid*, pp. 550-558; and as quoted by Harry Elmer Barnes, *World Politics in Modern Civilization*, p. 315.
151. *Recent Revelations of European Diplomacy*, 1928 edition, pp. 206, 213, 214. Published by Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., London.
152. *International Politics*, pp. 441-443. Published by McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., N. Y.
153. Lloyd George, *War Memoirs*, Vol. 6, pp. 305-307, 1937.
154. *The Problem of Asia*, pp. 97, 187.
155. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time*, Vol. 1, p. 77.
156. Christian Gauss, *The German Emperor as Shown in His Public Utterances*, p. 74.
157. *Politics*, Vol. 1, pp. 83, 28.
158. *Nationalism and Catholicism*, pp. 11, 12, 21, 22.
159. Quoted by William Archer, *Gems of German Thought*, p. 13; and quoted by A. D. McLaren, *Germanism From Within*, p. 224.
160. *The Last Will and Testament of Cecil J. Rhodes*, edited by W. T. Stead.
161. J. F. Scott, *Patriots in the Making*, p. 80.
162. Quoted by Georges Bourdon, *The German Enigma*, p. 77.
163. *The Psychology of the Great War*, pp. 103-105, 108.
164. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Edition, Vol. 1, p. 351.
165. Leonard Woolf, *Empire and Commerce in Africa*.
166. Charles Hodges, *The Background of International Relations*, p. 427. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

FOOTNOTES

167. *The Diplomacy of Imperialism*, Vol. 2, p. 797. Published by Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

168. *International Journal of Ethics*, XI., 1900, pp. 1-22.

169. W. S. Blunt, *My Diaries*, Vol. 1, pp. VII-IX.

170. This famous letter is reprinted in full by Sir Thomas Erskine Holland, *Letters to the Times upon War and Neutrality*, pp. 24-26.

171. General von Bernhardi, *Germany and the Next War*, English edition 1912, pp. 10, 18, 23.

172. Quoted by Norman Angell, *The Great Illusion*, p. 168.

173. Quoted by Christian Gauss, *Why We Went to War*, p. 12.

174. Quoted by Langer. Vol. 1, p. 89.

175. *Ibid.*, pp. 89, 90.

176. *Lord Roberts' Message to the Nation*, pp. 8, 9.

177. Harvey E. Fisk, *French Public Finance*, p. 2. Published by the Bankers Trust Company, New York.

178. *Fortnightly Review*, April 1, 1913, pp. 654, 655. The figures for 1913 are taken from *The Problem of Armaments*, by Arthur Guy Enoch, p. 186, with the exception of Austria-Hungary, which are listed as in 1912. In estimating the significance of these tables one must remember that the cost of production and upkeep varied considerably in the different countries.

179. Francis Neilson, *How Diplomats Make War*, p. 146.

180. Arthur Guy Enoch, *The Problems of Armaments*, pp. 178-180.

181. Parker T. Moon, *Syllabus on International Relations*, p. 75.

182. From, *The Problem of Armaments*, by Arthur Guy Enoch, p. 186.

183. Parker T. Moon, *Syllabus on International Relations*, p. 75.

184. *The Navy League Annual*, 1913-14, p. 353.

185. *Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 34.

186. Philip Kerr and Lionel Curtis, *The Prevention of War*, pp. 23, 24. *Italics mine.*

187. *Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, edited by Charles Seymour, Vol. 4, p. 191. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

188. *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George*, Vol. 5, pp. 199-203. Published by Little, Brown and Company, Boston.

189. *America's First Crusade*, p. 33. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

190. *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, by Ray Stannard Baker, Vol. 2, p. 17.

191. Herbert Hoover, *America's First Crusade*, pp. 50, 51.

192. Quoted in *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, by Ray Stannard Baker, Vol. 3, pp. 449-450.

193. *The Nation*, July 12, 1919, Vol. 109.

194. *Sunday Observer*, May 10, 1919.

195. David Lloyd George, *Where Are We Going?* pp. vi, 214.

196. *Nash's Pall Mall Magazine*, September 24, 1924.

197. Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, *The Problems of Lasting Peace*, p. 110. Published by Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., New York.

FOOTNOTES

198. James W. Angell, *The Recovery of Germany*, pp. 15, 16. Published by Yale University Press, New Haven.
199. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
200. From figures prepared by the National City Bank and published in *Nation's Business*, February, 1934, p. 27.
201. *Op. cit.*, p. 76.
202. G. D. H. Cole, *The Intelligent Man's Guide Through World Chaos*, pp. 86-94.
203. Quoted in the *Living Age*, March, 1931.
204. *The Round Table*, December, 1931.
205. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, Vol. 4, pp. 148, 187.
206. *America's First Crusade*, p. 71.
207. *Peacemaking*, 1919, pp. 13, 187.
208. *Op. cit.*, pp. 57, 37.
209. James T. Shotwell, *What Germany Forgot*, p. 50. Published by the Macmillian Company, New York.
210. *The New Statesman and Nation*, May 30, 1931.
211. Hugh Quigley and R. T. Clark, *Republican Germany*, p. 50. Published by Dodd, Mead and Company, New York.
212. *The New Statesman and Nation*, January 16, 1932.
213. G. P. Gooch, *Germany*, p. 171.
214. Henri Lichtenberger, *The Third Reich*, pp. 7, 9. Published by The Graystone Press, New York.
215. *Germany Enters the Third Reich*, pp. 46, 47.
216. June, 1932.
217. *The Fall of the German Republic*, pp. 200, 202, 203.
218. Toni Sender—*The Autobiography of a German Rebel*, pp. 281-286. Published by The Vanguard Press, New York.
219. *The Nation*, New York, March 25, 1931.
220. *Foreign Affairs*, October, 1931.
221. *Manchester Guardian*, October 9, 1931.
222. John W. Wheeler-Bennett, *The Pipe Dream of Peace*, pp. xiv, xv. Published by William Morrow and Company, New York.
223. Fritz Morstein Marx, *Government in the Third Reich*, pp. 44, 45. Published by McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
224. H. Frank, Imperial Minister of Justice, quoted by Aurel Kolnai, *The War Against the West*, p. 29.
225. Gustav Stolper, *Germany Economy 1870-1940*, p. 181. Published by Reynal and Hitchcock, New York.
226. Winston S. Churchill, *The Aftermath*, pp. 7, 8. (Italics mine.) Published by Charles Scribners' Sons, New York.
227. J. W. Angell, *The Recovery of Germany*, p. 360. Published by Yale University Press, New Haven.
228. *Ibid.*, pp. 191, 192.
229. *Ibid.*, pp. 363, 364.
230. *Ibid.*, p. 364.
231. See *Living Age*, November, 1932, p. 206.
232. *Living Age*, November, 1932, p. 206; the figures for November, 1932, are taken from Konrad Heiden, *A History of National Socialism*, p. 257.
233. G. P. Gooch, *Contemporary Review*, January, 1940. (Italics mine.)

FOOTNOTES

234. Quoted in the *North American Review*, March, 1934, p. 224.
235. *The New Statesman and Nation*, August 15, 1931.
236. *Journal of Royal Institute of International Affairs*, January, 1930.
237. *The Round Table*, December, 1930.
238. Arnold Brecht, *Prelude to Silence*. Published by Oxford University Press, New York.
239. Grover Clark, *The Great Wall Crumbles*, pp. 137, 138. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York.
240. Edward Thomas Williams, *A Short History of China*, p. 276. Published by Harper & Brothers, New York.
241. *The Far Eastern Policy of the United States*, p. 52. Published by Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York.
242. Quoted in *The Far Eastern Policy of the United States*, by A. Whitney Griswold, p. 83. (Italics mine.)
243. William L. Langer, *The Diplomacy of Imperialism*, Vol. 2, p. 704. Published by Alfred A. Knopf. (Italics mine.)
244. Nathaniel Peffer, *Must We Fight in Asia?* pp. 25, 31, 34, 35, 89. (Italics mine.) Published by Harper & Brothers, New York.
245. Parker T. Moon, *Imperialism and World Politics*, p. 344. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York.
246. Harold G. Moulton, *Japan: An Economic and Financial Appraisal*, p. 22. Published by the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.
247. John C. de Wilde, *Raw Materials in World Politics*, pp. 166, 167. Published by the Foreign Policy Association, New York City.
248. Harold G. Moulton, *Japan*, p. 614. Published by the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.
249. Albert E. Hindmarsh, *The Basis of Japanese Foreign Policy*, pp. 236, 237. Published by Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
250. Kenneth W. Colegrove, *Militarism in Japan*, pp. 5, 16, 18, 20. Published by The World Peace Foundation, Boston.
251. A. Whitney Griswold, *The Far Eastern Policy of the United States*, pp. 187, 188, 189.
252. Wilfred Fleisher, *Volcanic Isle*, p. 332. Published by Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York.
253. Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 401.
254. Alfred L. P. Dennis, *Adventures in American Diplomacy*, p. 63. Published by E. P. Dutton & Company, New York City.
255. Moorfield Storey and Marcial P. Lichauro, *The Conquest of the Philippines by the United States*, pp. 32-37. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York City.
256. Thomas A. Bailey, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Japanese-American Crises*, pp. 49, 50. Published by Stanford University Press, California.
257. *Op. cit.*, p. 222.
258. *Ibid*, VIII (Italics mine.)
259. James Grafton Rogers, *World Policing and the Constitution*, pp. 92-123. Published by World Peace Foundation, 40 Mt. Vernon St., Boston.

FOOTNOTES

261. Quoted by John T. Flynn, *The Truth About Pearl Harbor*, p. 7.
262. This and other important documents are bound in an invaluable volume issued by the State Department, entitled: *Peace and War*, United States Foreign Policy 1931-1941, 874 pages. Published by the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1943. Hereafter referred to as *Peace and War*.
263. *Peace and War*, p. 91. (Italics mine.)
264. Louis William Koenig, *The Presidency and the Crisis*, pp. 18, 19. Published by King's Crown Press, New York.
265. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. *Lend-Lease*, Weapon for Victory, pp. 24, 25. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York. (Italics mine.)
266. *Peace and War*, pp. 559, 560. (Italics mine.)
267. *Op. cit.*, 1940 volume, pp. 406. The Macmillan Company. (Italics mine.)
268. Forrest Davis and Ernest K. Lindley, *How War Came: An American White Paper; From the Fall of France to Pearl Harbor*, pp. 107, 108. Published by Simon and Schuster, New York.
269. Testimony of Admiral Richardson before the Barkley Pearl Harbor Committee.
270. Joseph C. Grew, *Ten Years in Japan*, pp. 359, 361. (Italics mine.) Published by Simon and Schuster, New York.
271. Navy Report on Pearl Harbor, Section VI.
272. Quoted in *The Truth About Pearl Harbor*, by John T. Flynn, p. 6. Published by the author, 15 East 40th Street, New York City.
273. Quoted by Flynn, *ibid.*, p. 6.
274. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., *Lend-Lease*, Weapons for Victory, pp. 109, 116, 117, 153. (Italics mine.) Published by The Macmillan Company, New York.
275. *Op. cit.*, pp. 388, 389.
276. John T. Flynn, *The Truth About Pearl Harbor*, p. 5. Published by the author, 15 East 40th Street, New York City.
277. *Op. cit.*, 1939 volume, pp. xxxviii-xl. Published by The Macmillan Co.
278. *Op. cit.*, 1940 volume, pp. xxiv, xxx. Published by The Macmillan Co.
279. Quoted by Flynn, *op. cit.*, p. 9. (Italics mine.)
280. Published by Simon and Schuster, New York.
281. Denys Smith, *America and the Axis War*, pp. 361, 364. (Italics mine.) Published by The Macmillan Company, New York.
282. *Op. cit.*, p. 444.
283. Navy Report on Pearl Harbor, Section X.
284. *Op. cit.*, p. 456.
285. Navy Pearl Harbor Report, Section VII.
286. *Peace and War*, p. 136.
287. Acts 4:12; Romans 1:16; I Corinthians 1:18.
288. See pp. 44, 45.
289. Matthew 16:21-23, Goodspeed.
290. Mark 9:30-32, Moffatt.
291. Luke 13:33, 34, Goodspeed.

FOOTNOTES

- 292. Mark 10:32-34, Goodspeed.
- 293. Mark 14:32-36, Moffatt.
- 294. Luke 23:23, 32, 33, Goodspeed.
- 295. Mark 15:33, 34, Goodspeed.
- 296. Luke 23:45, 46, Goodspeed.
- 297. Matthew 10:16, 17, 21, 22, Goodspeed.
- 298. Mark 8:34, 35, Goodspeed.
- 299. Luke 10:1-3, Twentieth Century.
- 300. John 12:24, 25, Moffatt.
- 301. John 15:17-20, 16:2, Goodspeed.

INDEX

- Angell, James W., 198, 199, 232, 233
 Arnold, General, 7
 Astor, Lady, 27
 Atomic bombs, 4-11, 88, 95, 135, 333
 Atomic poison gas, 9
 Atrocities, 1-4
 Bainton, Roland H., 139
 Benedict, Marion J., 133
 Bevin, Foreign Secretary, 55
 Blakney, Raymond Bernard, 113
 Bombing of civilians, 1-9, 25, 296
 Brailsford, H. N., 22
 Browder, Earl, 17
 Cadoux, Cecil John, 140
 Capitalism, 13-18, 28
 Cecil, Viscount, 221, 222
 China, 243-252, 293, 307, 314
 Christian pacifism, 95, 96, 137,
 159-162, 337-347
 Churches, record of, 138-162
 Churches and war, 103-162, 330-347
 Churchill, Winston, 19, 20, 196, 230,
 231, 297, 316
 Clark, R. T., 213
 Clemenceau, 189, 231
 Cole, G. D. H., 200, 201
 Colegrove, Kenneth W., 265
 Collective security, 39-42, 45, 47, 57
 Communism, 13-24
 Communist International, 16
 Concentration, 68-70
 Conscription, 88, 89
 Constantine, 141-143
 Cooperative movement, 71
 Corporate income, 63
 Crusades, 144-149
 Curti, Merle, 156
 Dallin, David J., 20, 25, 29, 33
 Davis, Forrest, 315
 Bennett, Tyler, 283
 Dennis, A. L. P., 278
 De Wilde, John C., 261
 Dictatorship of proletariat, 13, 15
 Disarmament, 87-89, 215
 Du Bois, W. E. B., 82, 83
 Dulles, John Foster, 48, 50
 Duranty, Walter, 18, 31
 Eckhart, Meister, 113
 Economic Justice, 60-73
 Eden, Anthony, 54
 Empires, 176-178
 Empires Into Commonwealths, 80-84
 European Powers in Far East, 243
 252
 Fair Employment Practices
 Committee, 77
 Faith, 334-339
 Fascism, 67
 Fay, Sidney B., 164, 165
 Fear, 36, 37
 Fedotov, George P., 35
 Finland, 21
 First World War, Origins of, 163-188
 Fleisher, Wilfred, 270
 Flynn, John T., 311
 Fosdick, Harry Emerson, 132
 Foster, Wm. Z., 17
 France, policy of, 189-193, 216, 217
 Full employment, 65, 66
 Germany
 Casualties in, 3
 Communists, 209-215, 236
 Economic factors, 196-202, 233, 234
 Loss of territory, 198
 Political factors, 206-215
 Psychological factors, 202, 206
 Republic, 230-242
 Social Democrats, 208-215, 236, 240
 Votes in, 236
 Winning, 89-92
 Zeppelins, 1-3, 134
 God, 103-138, 330-347
 Gooch, G. P., 166, 237

INDEX — CONTINUED

- Great Britain
 - and veto power, 41
 - Empire of, 82, 83
 - in Far East, 244-252
 - Intervention in Russia, 24
 - Near War with Russia, 20
- Griswold, A. Whitney, 250, 266-268
- Grew, Joseph C., 302, 305, 309, 320-322
- Hawaii, 272-275
- Henry, Patrick, 51
- Hillis, Newell Dwight, 156, 157
- Hiroshima, 4-6, 25
- Hitler, Adolf, 206, 224-230
- Hodges, Charles, 177
- Hoover, Calvin B., 212
- Hoover, J. Edgar, 325
- Hull, Cordell, 295, 299, 323
- Imperatives of world peace, 12-102
- Imperialism, 175-179
- Incendiary bombs, 9
- India, 85
- International Court of Justice, 58, 59
- International government, 39-60
- International Labor Organization, 59
- International police, 40-45
- Intervention, 284-286
- Japan
 - Aggression of, 252-270, 292
 - Casualties in, 3, 4
 - Industrialism, 261, 262
 - Militarism in, 265
 - Resources of, 261, 262
 - Treaty with Russia, 21
 - Winning, 92, 93
- Jesus, way of, 11; 103-138, 330-347
- Johnson, F. Ernest, 159
- Klausner, Joseph, 104
- Kelly, Thomas, 113, 114
- Kerr, Philip, 187
- Konoye, Prince, 318-321
- Labor unions, 72
- Langer, Wm. L., 178, 252
- Lawrence, W. H., 5
- League of Nations, 20, 59
- Lecky, W. E. H., 158, 159
- Lenin, 14-16, 21, 22, 26, 27
- Lichtenberger, Henri, 211
- Lindley, Ernest K., 315
- Lloyd-George, 167, 168, 193, 195, 238
- MacGregor, G. H. C., 122
- Militarism, 180-187
- Military necessity, 24, 25
- Military intervention, 284-286
- Montefiore, 104
- Moon, Parker T., 258, 269
- Morrison, Philip, 5
- Moulton, Harold G., 263
- Murray, Gilbert, 178
- National income, 61-65, 68, 69
- Nationalism, 52-53, 169-175
- Next steps, 97-100
- Nicolson, Harold, 204
- Non-violent non-cooperation, 79
- Old Testament, 129-134
- Olipphant, M. L. E., 9
- Outbreak of War in the Pacific, 243-329
- Oxford Conference, 129, 333
- Panay, 292
- People's movement, 93-97
- Peffer, Nathaniel, 253, 283
- Perry, Commodore, 255
- Philippine Islands, 275, 276, 298
- Planning, 67
- Pre-Pearl-Harbor Policy, 286-329
- Postyshev, 29
- Public ownership, 70
- Racial Justice, 73-80
- Revolution, 13-18, 21-24, 37
- Roberts, Lord, 182
- Rockets, 7, 8
- Rogers, James Grafton, 284
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 286-329
- Rosenberg, James N., 46, 47
- Russia (See Soviet Russia)
- Schuman, Frederick L., 167

INDEX — CONTINUED

- segregation, 77, 78
- Sunder, Toni, 213
- Symonds, General, 193, 222
- Tolson, Edgar, 33, 35
- Social Democrats, 208-215, 236, 240
- Social insurance, 72
- Socialist Party, 72
- Soviet Russia
 - Aid to, 49
 - and League of Nations, 20
 - and the ILO, 59
 - and race relations, 74
 - and Union Now, 43-45
 - and veto power, 40, 41, 45, 53
 - Casualties, 49
 - Dictatorship in, 32
 - Expects hostility, 13-20
 - Friendly relations with, 12-39
 - In defense of, 21-31
 - Indoctrination in, 31, 32
 - Isolation of, 19
 - Recognition of, 20
 - Religion in, 34-36
 - Revolution in, 21-24
 - Secret police, 29-31
 - Strategy of, 13, 24-31, 33, 38
 - Terror in, 29
 - Treaty with Japan, 21
 - War with Finland, 20
- Stalin, Joseph, 15, 16, 20, 27, 30, 33, 34
- Stettinius, E. R., Jr., 298, 307
- Stevens, Edmund, 33
- Storey, Moorfield, 279
- Strait, Clarence, 43, 44
- Strikes, 64
- Submarines, 8
- Sulzberger, Arthur, 288
- Supreme Court, 46, 47
- Sungye, Nigel, 7, 8
- Taxation, 71
- Temporary National Economic Committee, 62, 68
- Theologians report, 129, 135, 333, 351
- Time factor, 101, 102, 187
- Treaty of Versailles, 165, 215
- Trotsky, Leon, 22, 23, 30
- Trusteeship Council, 85, 86
- Ultimatums, 187
- Union Now, 43-45
- United Nations Organization
 - Assembly, 47-50, 56
 - Description of, 39, 49, 50
 - Economic and Social Council, 48, 56, 57
 - List of members, 349
 - Trusteeship Council, 85, 86
 - Veto power, 40, 41, 45, 53, 335, 336
- United States
 - and veto power, 41
 - Intervention in Russia, 24
 - Japanese in, 281, 282
 - Military bases, 84
 - Pre-Pearl-Harbor Policy, 286-329
 - Record in Far East, 271-286
 - Record of Intervention, 284-286
 - War with Spain, 275-281
- U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 63
- V-1 Rockets, 7, 8
- Verbeck, G. F., 256
- Wallace, Henry, 65, 66
- War
 - Allies in, 90, 91
 - Description of, 1-9
 - In Old Testament, 129-134
 - Number of, 81
 - Oxford Conference on, 129, 335
 - Preparedness for, 9, 10
 - Profits in, 63
 - Results of, 1-9, 25, 49, 135
 - Theologians' report, 129, 135
 - Westermarck, Edward, 158
 - Wheeler-Bennett, J. W., 223
 - Wolfers, Arnold, 238
 - World Tomorrow, 167
 - World War II, Origins of, 189-242
 - Wright, Quincy, 81
 - Zeppelins, 1-3, 134

